DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 813 HE 017 683

TITLE Review of South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education.
INSTITUTION South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 90p.; For the review summary, see HE 017 682. For the South Carolina Master Plan, see ED 183 055.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; *College Desegregation; *College Planning; College Programs; College Role; Educational Finance; Financial Policy; Governance; Higher Education; *Master Plans; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; *State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; Student Financial Aid; Teacher Salaries; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

A review of the South Carolina master plan for higher education is presented. The following issues are addressed: coordination and governance, roles and missions of state colleges and universities, enrollment projections, program review, prerequisites for freshman admission, quality incentives, desegregation of state institutions, finances, and facilities. Information is provided on the following existing programs which were reviewed: mathematics, physical sciences, engineering, biological sciences, health and medical education, business, foreign languages, and associate degree programs. Progress toward meeting the state's plan to enhance programs at South Carolina State College and Denmark Technical College, traditionally black institutions, is discussed, along with desegregation of student enrollment, faculty and staff, and governing boards. State appropriations for 1974, 1980, 1983 are compared, as are state appropriations per full-time equivalent student in the 14 Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. Additional data cover: a comparison of faculty salary averages in the SREB states, tuition and fees for resident students, and student financial awards by type of programs. Appended materials included a proposed revision of the desegregation plan, and the 1984-1985 appropriation formula. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248813

HE 017 693

REVIEW OF

SOUTH CAROLINA MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
South Carolina Commission on H. E.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

December 1983

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

REVIEW OF

SOUTH CAROLINA MASTER PLAN

FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

December 1983

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

"In the higher education community, our most precious asset is public confidence. If we are to keep that confidence, we must maintain quality in the academic and other missions which the public has entrusted to our enterprise. If we fail to do so, the public will, rightfully, withhold its support. The challenge to realize the highest possible standards is never ending . . ."

J. W. Peltason, President
American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Fred R. Sheheen (1986)
Chairman
Camden

Robert C. Gallager (1986)
Vice Chairman
Charleston

George L. Brightharp (1986)
Trenton

Willa J. DeWitt (1984)
Conway

Roosevelt Gilliam, Jr. (1984)
Lancaster

Robert E. Graham (1986)
Sumter

Harold W. Jacobs (1986)
Columbia

Alba M. Lewis (1984)
Orangeburg

David B. Smith (1986)
Bennettsville

Mortimer F. Smith (1984)
Cayce

Nanette H. Smyth (1986)
Beaufort

Nelle H. Taylor (1984)
Saluda

Robert L. Utsey, Jr. (1984)
St. George

Hugh H. Wells (1986)
Seneca

Robert F. Williams (1984)
Greer

Louis D. Wright, Jr. (1984)
Florence

Robert L. Wynn III (1986)
Spartanburg

COMMISSION STAFF

Howard R. Boozer
Executive Director

George P. Fulton
Special Assistant to
the Executive Director

Charles A. Brooks, Jr.
Assistant Director,
Financial Affairs

Frank E. Kinard
Assistant Director,
Programs and Research

John C. Sutusky
Assistant Director,
Health Affairs

Alan S. Krech
Coordinator,
Research

Cannon R. Mayes
Coordinator,
Student Affairs

James A. Paschal
Coordinator,
Facilities Planning

Alvena M. Smarr
Coordinator,
State Desegregation Plan

Carol D. Waldo
Coordinator,
Budgeting Systems

Lynn W. Metcalf
Data Management and
Research Analyst

Sarah R. Palmer
Accountant

Diane K. Jones
Administrative Assistant

Ann J. Shelton
Administrative Assistant

Gaylon E. Syrett
Administrative Assistant

Elizabeth J. Drakeford
Secretary

Janet K. Stewart
Secretary

Denise L. Jones
Clerk Typist

Leslie E. Ouellette
Key Entry Operator

Ann C. Klingenhagen
Librarian

CONTENTS

		Page
	List of Tables	v
	Foreword	vii
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Policy Issues	3
	Coordination and Governance, 3	
	Roles and Missions of South Carolina Public Higher Education Institutions, 6	
	Universities, 6	
	Senior Colleges, 9	
	Two-Year Colleges, 10	
	Enrollment Projections, 13	
	Program Quality, 15	
	Review of New Programs, 15	
	Review of Existing Programs, 15	
	Mathematics, 16	
	Physical Sciences, 18	
	Engineering, 18	
	Biological Sciences, 20	
	Health and Medical Education, 20	
	Business, 22	
	Foreign Languages, 23	
	Associate Degree Programs, 24	
	Programs to be Reviewed in 1983-84 and Subsequent Years, 25	
	Prerequisites for Freshman Admission, 25	
	Quality Incentives, 27	
	Desegregation of Public Colleges and Universities, 28	
	Enhancement of Traditionally Black Institutions, 29	
	Desegregation of Student Enrollment, 30	
	Desegregation of Faculty and Staff, 31	
	Desegregation of Governing Boards, 31	
	Desegregation Plan Activities for 1983-84, 35	
	Finances, 36	
	State Appropriations, 36	
	Regional Comparisons, 38	
	Escalating Student Fees, 40	
	Appropriation Formula, 43	
	Budgetary Process, 44	
	Student Financial Aid, 45	
	Facilities, 50	
	Capital Improvements, 51	
	Rehabilitation and Maintenance, 51	
III.	Procedures for Annual Review of the Master Plan	55
	APPENDICES	
	A. Proposed Revision of the Governing Boards of [South Carolina Public Colleges and Universites], State Higher Education Desegregation Plan, Appendix K, pp. 269-75	
	B. 1984-85 Appropriation Formula	

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
I.	Actual and Projected Enrollments, Fall 1982	13
II.	Summary of Program Reviews	17
III.	Associate Degree Programs Terminated in 1983	24
IV.	Requirements for High School Graduation and Prerequisites for Freshman Admission to S. C. Public Senior Institutions	26
V.	Composition of Governing Boards of S. C. Public Colleges and Universities, the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, and the S. C. Commission on Higher Education, July 1983	34
VI.	Comparison of South Carolina Educational Appropriations (1974, 1980, and 1983)	37
VII.	Comparison of State Appropriations per FTE Student in the SREB States, 1980-81 to 1982-83	39
VIII.	Comparison of Faculty Salary Averages in the SREB States, 1980-81 to 1982-83	41
IX.	Analysis of Tuition and Required Fees for Resident Students	42
X.	Student Aid in South Carolina Colleges and Universities, Public and Private	46
XI.	Estimated Student Financial Aid in South Carolina, by Sector, 1982-83	47
XII.	Capital Funds Provided by the S. C. General Assembly for the Public Colleges and Universities, 1968-83	52

FOREWORD

The Commission on Higher Education, with the continuous support of the Governor and the General Assembly, highlights its recent actions in this review of the Master Plan and sets forth a future agenda to enhance the excellence and quality of higher education in South Carolina.

Progress

- The Commission has requested, and the Budget and Control Board has recommended, special funding for a quality incentive program for creative and unusual projects at the institutions based on merit and academic excellence.

- The Commission has adopted a set of prerequisites, effective in Fall 1988, for all freshmen admitted to baccalaureate degree programs in public senior institutions. These prerequisites have been adopted by all the public senior colleges and universities.

- The Commission has administered, monitored, and evaluated progress in the implementation of the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan to the satisfaction of State and federal authorities.

- The Commission proposed legislation for the coordination of the two medical schools in the State and is participating in the joint medical education board created by the Governor and the two institutions.

- The Commission has expanded its Appropriation Formula to include medical and dental education as well as other unique health programs not previously included.

- The Commission has completed a building quality survey in which the condition of existing facilities at the public colleges and universities,

including technical colleges, was evaluated, guiding the State in the expenditure of funds for renovation and rehabilitation.

• The Commission directed the development of an articulation agreement to regularize the transfer to senior colleges of credits earned in college parallel associate degree programs in the technical colleges. The agreement will be implemented in 1984.

• The Commission began in 1980 a review of all existing academic degree programs, by major field of study. A total of 145 programs in nine different categories have been reviewed; four have been singled out for excellence, 17 have been substantially modified, and 11 have been eliminated.

Recommendations

• The Commission recommends to the General Assembly that the institutions be provided with full formula funding, in accordance with the "Position Paper on the Improvement of Education in South Carolina" adopted by the Commission in November 1983.

• Legislation is recommended to require that the Education Committees of the General Assembly concur as a requisite to overturn Commission decisions to terminate academic degree programs.

• Legislation is recommended to require that all requests for funds or authorization be submitted by the institutions to the Commission for its recommendations before being considered by the General Assembly.

• Legislation is recommended to provide that the governing board of each of the public institutions, except that of Clemson University, be composed of 15 members, 12 selected geographically and three at large.

Studies Underway

• The Commission currently has underway a study of projected enrollments at the colleges and universities and the potential effects of limiting enrollments at each of the public senior institutions.

• The Commission is making a study of student tuition and required fees in comparison with such student charges in other states. Students attending public colleges and universities in South Carolina are paying considerably higher tuition and required fees than those attending public institutions in other southeastern states.

• The Commission is reviewing institutional requests for additional funding which may be needed in the next year for computer equipment, for new or replacement equipment for research or instruction, and for deferred building maintenance.

• The Commission, in cooperation with the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and with the University of South Carolina, is preparing a comparative cost study of programs leading to associate degrees in the two-year institutions.

• The Commission is studying the feasibility of a Statewide summer employment program for students and of a scholarship program for honors students.

I. INTRODUCTION

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education was created by the 1967 South Carolina General Assembly as the State coordinating agency in higher education. The General Assembly in 1978 (in Act 410) restructured the Commission and mandated the development of a master plan for higher education which the new Commission immediately initiated upon its appointment in July 1978.

The work was accomplished by the Commission and staff through 23 task forces with members drawn from the colleges and universities, the Legislature, other State agencies, and the public. A comprehensive Master Plan dealing with such subjects as goals, institutional missions, finances, facilities, academic programs, and student and faculty matters was completed in December 1979, published in February 1980, and approved in principle by the General Assembly on April 1, 1980. It contained a number of recommendations and projected Commission actions.*

This review consists of a detailed discussion of selected major policy issues. It is consistent with the requirement in the legislation that the Master Plan be reviewed annually, and follows a 1982 progress report on implementation of the Plan.

Many recent Commission actions have resulted, directly or indirectly, from recommendations in the Master Plan. As a point of departure, that Plan has been of major importance with respect to the agenda of the Commission on Higher Education since 1980. It will continue to be an important factor in the future work of the Commission.

---

*South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education, Columbia, December 1979, 375 pages.

II. POLICY ISSUES

Coordination and Governance

The Commission recommended in the Master Plan that no substantial changes be made in the legislative mandate which prescribes a coordinating function for the Commission. It now believes that the existing statutes provide the necessary authority with the exceptions as noted.

The current legislation governing the institutional appeal process allows only one legislative committee (either the House Committee on Education and Public Works or the Senate Education Committee) to deny a Commission recommendation for program termination. The Commission supported legislation introduced in 1981 to seek greater equity by requiring that both Committees agree as a requisite for overturning a Commission decision to close a program. The bill was passed by the Senate in 1982 but was tabled in the House Committee on Education and Public Works. The Commission recommends that the proposed amendment to the appeals procedure be enacted.

It was also noted in the Master Plan that the present system of coordination could be more effective if the public institutions did not present requests for funds or authorization directly to the General Assembly. The Commission recommended that the General Assembly require that public institutions submit all requests initially to the Commission and that the General Assembly not act on any institutional requests until the Commission has given its written endorsement or disapproval of the requests.

This recommendation was partially implemented by legislation enacted by the 1980 General Assembly (Act 518) requiring that all public higher education institutions submit their requests for capital improvements to the Commission for its review and recommendations to the Budget and Control Board. The

budget process has also been improved since 1980. The budgetary requirements of the General Assembly, the Budget and Control Board, and the Commission on Higher Education have been reconciled and the public colleges, universities, and the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education have been using one uniform procedure for the past four years.

While progress has been made, the Commission reaffirms its 1979 recommendation that legislation be enacted to require that all requests for funds or authorization be submitted by the institutions to the Commission for its recommendations before being considered by the General Assembly. The Commission also reaffirms its earlier recommendation that all applications for support from federal or other sources submitted by public colleges and universities which require approval by the Governor's Office or the Budget and Control Board be referred to the Commission for review and comment to the appropriate agency.

The Commission noted in the Master Plan that the members of the governing boards of the public colleges and universities were predominantly white males, and recommended that legislation be enacted to provide for the equitable representation of women and minorities on those boards.

Legislation enacted by the 1983 General Assembly provided for the appointment or election of members of governing boards on the basis of merit without regard to race, creed, or gender and stipulated that selections be such that the boards are representative of all citizens of the State. That legislation also authorized the Governor to appoint one additional member to the governing board of each public senior college and university except Clemson (because of a provision in the Thomas Clemson Will) and one designee each to the USC and MUSC boards. As a result of this legislation, the Governor appointed eight minority members (five men and three women) to the six affected boards in July 1983. In addition, the General Assembly elected a minority member to the Clemson Board of Trustees in February 1983.

The legislation enacted in 1983 was an important interim step; it does not ensure equitable representation of women and minorities on governing boards, however, as recommended in the Master Plan. Laws which restrict board membership based on race, gender, institutional affiliation, geographical residence, or political office serve to maintain present inequities. The Commission continues to support the position that legislation should be enacted to provide equitable representation of women and minorities on the governing boards of the public colleges and universities. The Commission therefore recommends that legislation be enacted, based on Appendix K to the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan,* to provide that each governing board, except that of Clemson University, be composed of 15 members, excluding ex officio members, two members elected by the General Assembly from each Congressional District and three members at large appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate. The Commission recommends that the Clemson board consist of 13 members, seven being successors to those named in the Thomas Clemson Will, three members elected at large by the General Assembly, and three members appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate.

*Appendix K to the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Roles and Missions of South Carolina Public Higher Education Institutions

The Master Plan defined the missions of the public colleges and universities in the State to assure that the higher education needs of the State can be met with optimum efficiency and effectiveness.

As in all other states, public institutions in South Carolina can be categorized as universities, senior colleges, and two-year colleges.

Universities

Universities offer comprehensive degree programs at the baccalaureate level, a number and range of graduate and professional programs consistent with the specific mission of each, and diverse research programs and public service activities consistent with these graduate and professional programs. Admission standards at universities usually require that applicants have the preparation, motivation and aptitude necessary to promise reasonable success in rigorous academic programs.

The specific missions of Clemson University, the Medical University of South Carolina, and the University of South Carolina-Columbia remain as described in the Master Plan.

An exception concerns the offering of vocational associate degree programs by USC-Columbia. As a result of the Master Plan, the Commission studied the propriety of continuing to offer at USC-Columbia associate degree programs in seven specific occupational areas (excluding nursing), and in 1981 recommended that the University phase out these programs in order to concentrate its resources on its principal mission. The University appealed this recommendation, as permitted under the

statutes, and was upheld in its appeal by the Committee on Education and Public Works of the House of Representatives.

Subsequently, the University in 1982 began phasing out its associate degree programs in criminal justice, and in 1983 began phasing out its remaining occupational associate degree programs in institutional administration, office administration, commercial science, child development, retail management, and technical nursing.

In Fall 1982 the Commission, having been requested by the Budget and Control Board to reallocate a substantial sum in recommended State appropriations for 1983-84, solicited suggestions for accomplishing this task from a wide variety of sources. Several of these suggestions called for meaningful changes in the missions of some institutions. These suggestions were rejected by the Commission for the immediate purpose, but were referred to its Committee on Academic Affairs for further study. These included separate suggestions that:

1) doctoral programs of low productivity which are duplicated be terminated; and
2) graduate programs in engineering at USC-Columbia and in business, education, the humanities, and social sciences at Clemson be terminated.

The Commission conducted special studies of each of these interrelated suggestions. As a result, the Commission in June 1983 rejected them, noting heavy reliance on the mission statements for each institution contained in the Master Plan and on the Commission's conclusions following reviews of degree programs conducted since 1980.

The Commission continues to place major emphasis on the coordination

of medical education. The training of an appropriate number of physicians is not only extraordinarily expensive but is essential to the future health of the citizens of the State. The appropriate roles and activities of the two medical schools in South Carolina must therefore be clearly defined and closely coordinated.

In furtherance of this goal, the Commission, following review of the report of the out-of-state consultants who reviewed all graduate programs in health and medical education in 1981, established in 1982 a Blue Ribbon Committee on Medical Doctor Education. The charge to this Committee dealt with such matters as the distribution (geographic location and specialty) of physicians; the extent to which health care is under-utilized by blacks; projections of the need for and supply of physicians, including black physicians; the financing of medical education by the State; the particular mission of the USC School of Medicine; and the possible reorganization of medical education, specifically the feasibility and desirability of merging the two medical schools.

The findings and recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee were presented to the Commission in February 1983. In April 1983 the Commission rejected the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee that the total state enrollment of entering undergraduate medical students be limited to 200, and that the Commission devise a plan for merger of the two existing schools of medicine.

The Commission instead proposed legislation which would create a statutory Joint Board of Medical Education to coordinate more closely the activities of the two schools. Legislative action on this bill was not completed prior to adjournment of the 1983 General Assembly. Subsequently, a voluntary agreement was entered into by the institutions and the Office of the Governor, with later participation by the Commission, to

establish a similar coordinating mechanism for medical education. If this mechanism does not prove to be effective, the Commission will urge the enactment of appropriate legislation.

The Commission in July 1983 adopted a formula for funding medical education at USC and MUSC (including dentistry at MUSC) for 1984-85, as recommended in the Master Plan. This formula is similar in principle to that which has been in use by the Commission for over a decade to guide its recommendations for State funding for other public senior institutions.

Senior Colleges

Senior colleges, in South Carolina as elsewhere, are characterized by relatively comprehensive degree offerings at the baccalaureate level, and by the offering of some graduate programs below the doctoral level in fields where the institution has unusual competence and in which the local demand is high and cannot be more effectively met by other means. Organized programs of public service are common; organized programs of research are less so. Admission requirements for undergraduates at senior colleges are generally less stringent than those at universities but demand demonstration of adequate preparation, motivation, and aptitude.

Specific mission statements for each of the nine public senior colleges, conforming to the general outline given above, are contained in the Master Plan.

Only two explicit amendments have been made. The Commission in 1983 approved the offering by Lander College of its first graduate-level program -- the M.Ed. in elementary education. In 1982 the Commission approved, for implementation in 1983, a doctoral program at South Carolina State College leading to the Ed.D. in educational administration, accompanied by the stipulation that the corresponding program at USC-Columbia

would be phased out concurrently. This change was first forecast in the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan, approved by the U.S. Office of Education in 1981. No other doctoral programs are planned for any of the senior colleges.

As recommended by the out-of-state consultants who reviewed the matter for the Commission in 1980, associate degree programs in occupational areas have been or are being phased out at all senior colleges.

Two-Year Colleges

Two-year colleges offer programs up to and including the associate degree, as well as programs of shorter duration which may lead to certificates or diplomas designed for training in skills and crafts for immediate employment. Degree programs may be occupational in nature, designed to prepare students for employment, or may be academic, designed to prepare students for transfer to senior institutions in pursuit of baccalaureate degrees. Public service activities are encouraged, but organized research programs in these institutions are rare. Admission requirements are minimal, accompanied by the offering of remedial programs to assist underprepared students in developing the necessary skills to succeed in the programs of their choice.

Specific mission statements for the 16 technical colleges operated by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (SBTCE) and for the five two-year campuses of the University of South Carolina system are contained in the Master Plan.

Seven technical colleges (Chesterfield-Marlboro, Greenville, Midlands, Tri-County, Trident, Williamsburg, and York) are now authorized to offer Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree programs designed for transfer to senior colleges and universities.

Each of these seven institutions has been separately authorized by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the Commission on Higher Education to offer these programs. In each case, consideration was given to the question of providing opportunity for, and adequate access to, college programs at the lowest feasible cost to the State and to potential students.

Consultants to the Commission in 1980 strongly recommended that these college parallel associate degree programs in technical colleges be retained. The Commission concurs in that recommendation. To limit access by eliminating or greatly curtailing opportunities which exist in the college parallel associate degree programs in SBTCE institutions would not, the Commission believes, be in the best interests of the State.

If these programs were eliminated, many of these students would enroll in senior colleges and universities, where State funding is higher. For each full-time-equivalent (FTE) student in these programs removed as a "saving" from the technical education system, net State funding would increase. Cost savings within that system would be more than off-set by increased State funding in the senior colleges. The result would be an increase rather than a decrease in required State support of postsecondary education as a whole.

The Commission in 1982 requested that its Advisory Committee on Academic Programs devise an articulation agreement to regularize the transfer to senior colleges of credits earned in college parallel associate degree programs in the technical colleges. The proposed agreement was approved by the Commission in 1983 for implementation in 1984.

Responding to a "cost-saving" suggestion made to it in the fall of 1982, the Commission conducted a special study in 1982-83 of whether the two systems of two-year public institutions should be merged or, if not, whether certain institutions in one system should be merged with those of the other located in proximity. The Commission concluded that merger of the systems, or of specific institutions in the systems, should not be recommended at this time.

As an outgrowth of this study, however, the staff of the Commission, with the assistance of USC and SBTCE staffs, is analyzing actual expenditures in the past three fiscal years at each of the 21 public two-year institutions. After completion of this cost study in March 1984, the data will be reviewed to determine areas in which savings may be realized or cost effectiveness increased, including such matters as possible structural changes or consolidation of purchasing procedures, library acquisitions, student records, or institutional support.

Barring unforeseen circumstances, and pending the conclusion of current studies described above, the Commission reaffirms the specific mission statements contained in the Master Plan for each of the public institutions, with the specific amendments that have been noted.

Enrollment Projections

Enrollment projections contained in the 1979 Master Plan were that headcount enrollment in all institutions in the State would peak for the 1980's in 1982 and 1983 at about 141,000, with an estimated uncertainty of about 5%. Total headcount enrollment in Fall 1982 in all institutions in the State was reported at about 137,500, less than but within the estimated error range of the original projections.

A more detailed comparison of the projections made in 1978 for Fall 1982 and the actual reported enrollments is given below:

Table I

ACTUAL AND PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS, FALL 1982
(Headcount Enrollment, Thousands)

Sector and Level	Projected	Actual
Public Sr. Colls. and Univs.		
Undergraduates	57.4	58.2
Graduates	16.1	13.5
Technical Colleges	40.4	37.5
Subtotal	113.9	109.2
Private Colls. and Univs.	26.8	28.3
Total	140.7	137.5

The projected headcount enrollment of undergraduates at senior colleges and universities, including branches, was close to the actual figure. Enrollment of graduate students and of students in technical colleges was less than had been projected.

It was not possible earlier to make separate projections for each of the public institutions. To be of assistance to the institutions, projections should be made separately for full-time and for part-time

students. To the extent possible, the projections should also be made separately on other demographic characteristics such as race and sex.

The Commission has requested the staff to complete a new set of enrollment projections, extending to 1990, prepared separately for each institution. This study, to be completed by May 1984, is to include an analysis of the projected utilization of existing facilities at each institution. The potential effects of limiting enrollments at each of the public senior institutions will be analyzed in light of these projections.

Program Quality

The Commission on Higher Education regularly evaluates the quality of proposals for new programs and of existing degree programs. As proposed in the Master Plan, the Commission inaugurated a system of reviews of existing programs both to improve quality and to eliminate unnecessary duplication of programs in the institutions.

In addition, the Commission in 1983 recommended that public senior colleges and universities adopt a new policy which requires that by Fall 1988 freshmen applying for admission to baccalaureate degree programs shall have completed a minimum set of prescribed high school courses.

Review of New Programs

To help ensure that new programs will be of high quality, the Commission continues to require that institutions provide specific information on the justification of and the need for new programs, as well as details on curriculum, students, faculty, physical plant and equipment, library resources, and funding. These factors are examined carefully by the Commission before action is taken on a proposed program.

During the past year the Commission considered and rejected a suggestion that for each new program approved, one be terminated at the same institution.

Review of Existing Programs

The purpose of the Commission's review of existing programs is threefold: to determine whether any apparent duplication of programs should be continued, to assist the institutions in identifying programs of special excellence, and to identify programs which may be in need of strengthening if they are to be continued.

Existing graduate programs in five major areas of study were reviewed in 1980-81. These fields -- mathematics, physical sciences, engineering, biological sciences, and health and medical education -- were selected for review in this initial phase because they are the five major areas in which duplication of doctoral programs occurs between or among the public universities. In addition, reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs in business and foreign languages were completed in 1982 and 1983, respectively. The results of these reviews are summarized in Table II.

Each review was conducted by a team of out-of-state consultants approved by the Commission from a list of nominees submitted by each of the institutions, from national organizations such as the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and from the appropriate professional societies. The report of each consulting team was sent to each institution involved for review and comment. Their responses were taken into account by the appropriate standing committee of the Commission in its deliberations.

Mathematics. Graduate programs in mathematics at Clemson University, the University of South Carolina, The Citadel, and Winthrop College were reviewed in 1980. On January 8, 1981, the Commission concurred in the following recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs based on the report of the consultants:

1) that the program leading to the M.S. in mathematics at Clemson be commended for having achieved regional recognition in applied mathematics;
2) that the program leading to the M.A.T. in mathematics at Winthrop be redesigned to more accurately reflect its stated purpose, and that Winthrop submit a plan for restructuring this program or for terminating it; and

Table II

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEWS

	No. Institutions Involved	No. Degree Programs Reviewed*	No. Programs Terminated	No. Programs Formally Modified	No. Programs Singled Out For Excellence
FY 1980-81					
Biological Sciences (Graduate only)	6	24	0	1	0
Engineering (Graduate Only)	2	14	1	2	2
(MS in Materials Engineering at Clemson being phased out)					
Health and Medical (Graduate only)	5	15	1	0	0
(MS in Speech Path. & Aud. at Winthrop being terminated, in process)					
Mathematics (Graduate only)	4	6	0	1	1
(MAT at Winthrop being formally modified)					
Physical Sciences (Graduate only)	2	8	0	0	0
Associate Degrees in Sr. Institutions	3	9	9	0	-
(Occupational AD programs at USC-Columbia (7), USC-Aiken (1), and Lander (1). CHE recommended that 8 programs, at Lander and USC-Columbia, be phased out or converted to baccalaureate. USC-Columbia won appeal, but has since voluntarily terminated these 7 plus that in technical nursing.)					
AA/AS degrees in Tech. Colls.	6	6	0	0	-
(A seventh such program was approved in 1981-82)					
FY 1981-82					
Business (Bacc. and higher)	11	37	0	13	1
(CHE adopted policy position on meeting professional accreditation standards)					
FY 1982-83					
Foreign Languages (Bacc. & higher)	8	26	-	-	-
Subtotal	-	145*	11	17	4
FY 1983-84 (Funds Permitting)					
History (Bacc. and higher)	11	16	-	-	-
Political Science (Bacc. & higher)	11	15	-	-	-

*For graduate programs, counted once only if both Masters' and Doctoral programs offered by the same institution.

17

3) that the remaining graduate programs in mathematics be continued, not only to provide needed opportunities within the State and the region but also to fulfill adequately the stated missions of the institutions.

With respect to the second recommendation above, Winthrop College subsequently redirected this program as suggested, in a plan that was approved by the Commission on November 3, 1983.

Physical Sciences. Graduate programs in the physical sciences at Clemson University and at USC-Columbia were reviewed in 1980. On January 8, 1981, the Commission concurred in the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs based on the report of the consultants:

1) that the existing graduate programs in chemistry, textile science, and physics at Clemson and in chemistry, geology, and physics at USC-Columbia be continued; and
2) that both institutions be commended for the progress each had made in developing programs of "intellectual distinction," especially given the relatively short time since most of these programs were initiated.

Engineering. Graduate programs in engineering at Clemson and at USC-Columbia were reviewed in 1981. Based on the report of the consultants and the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Commission on November 15, 1981, adopted the following recommendations:

1) that the graduate program in environmental systems engineering at Clemson University be singled out for special commendation because this program has, in the words of the consultants, "achieved outstanding national visibility and stature";

2) that the televised system of graduate engineering courses known as APOGEE, offered by USC-Columbia, be singled out for special commendation, as an exemplary and successful effort on the part of USC to meet the needs of employed engineers throughout the State for continuing formal education;

3) that Clemson conduct a study to determine whether and to what extent there should be more formal coordination among its graduate programs in systems engineering, engineering management, and management science, with a report and recommendations on this subject to be submitted to the Commission;

4) that, in view of the consultants' recommendation, the graduate program in materials engineering at Clemson be terminated unless Clemson has demonstrated to the Commission that the program should be continued;

5) that both universities seek to increase enrollment of well-qualified graduate students, especially of women and minorities, as recommended by the consultants; and

6) that the remaining graduate engineering programs at Clemson and USC-Columbia be continued, commending to the attention of the respective institutions the suggestions made by the consultants with respect to each.

With respect to the suggested coordination of certain graduate programs in engineering and in business at Clemson (number 3 above), Clemson proposed and the Commission concurred that the graduate program in systems engineering be retitled industrial engineering, and that the graduate

program in engineering management be retitled industrial management. The first is to be operated solely by the College of Engineering and the second solely by the College of Industrial Management and Textile Science.

With respect to the proposed termination of the program in materials engineering at Clemson (number 4 above), Clemson agreed in October 1982 that this program should be phased out.

Biological Sciences. Graduate programs in the biological sciences at Clemson University, the Medical University of South Carolina, the University of South Carolina, The Citadel, the College of Charleston, and Winthrop College were reviewed by a five-member team of consultants in 1980. The Commission approved the following recommendations based on the report of the consultants and of the Committees on Academic Affairs and on Health and Medical Education:

1) that the Commission agree to the continuation of all existing graduate degree programs in the biological sciences as recommended by the consultants; and
2) that the Commission accept the remainder of the report for information only, with the following observations:
   a) that the Commission does not necessarily concur with some of the judgmental statements made about agencies and institutions in the report; and
   b) that no policy or course of action proposed in the report is adopted or endorsed except by past or future specific action of the Commission on each particular matter.

Health and Medical Education. Graduate programs in health and medical education at the Medical University of South Carolina, the University of South Carolina, Clemson University, South Carolina State

College, and Winthrop College were reviewed in 1981. On February 5, 1982, the Commission adopted a number of recommendations based on the report of the consultants and review by the Committee on Health and Medical Education. The major recommendations are summarized below:

1) that the report of the consultants be received with the following observations:

   a) that the Commission does not necessarily concur with some of the judgmental statements made in the report; and
   b) that no policy or course of action addressed in the report is adopted or endorsed except by past or future specific action of the Commission on each particular matter.

2) that the Consortium of Community Hospitals be maintained as a unified Statewide entity, administered by the Medical University of South Carolina, and that the Consortium be singled out for special commendation;

3) that the missions of the medical schools at MUSC and USC be clarified and differentiated;

4) that a collaborative medical school admissions program be developed by the medical schools to ensure that the best qualified students are enrolled and are matched to the most appropriate school, and that efforts to increase minority enrollment are strengthened;

5) that MUSC and USC review funding support allocated to their graduate nursing programs;

6) that Clemson University and MUSC not pursue plans to establish doctoral nursing programs at this time;

7) that the Budget and Control Board's Office of Cooperative Health Statistics undertake a study to project the supply and demand for dental medicine in the State, and that the Commission appoint a blue ribbon committee to study the future demand for physicians; and

8) that graduate programs in health and medical education currently offered at Clemson University, MUSC, South Carolina State College, USC, and Winthrop College be continued, with the exception that Winthrop's graduate program in speech pathology be continued provisionally pending submission of a self-study and further action by the Commission.

With respect to the last-named program above, the Commission voted on November 3, 1983, that the graduate program in speech pathology at Winthrop College be phased out with no students to be admitted beyond the 1984 Spring Semester.

Business. In addition to the first five reviews, which were limited to graduate programs, graduate and undergraduate programs in business and management at all public colleges and universities were reviewed in 1982. On September 9, 1982, the Commission concurred with the following recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs based on the report of the consultants:

1) that all current undergraduate and graduate programs in business in public senior colleges and universities be continued;

2) that all public institutions offering graduate and undergraduate programs in business be encouraged either to seek accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) or to have all such programs meet the substantive Standards of that agency, and that each institution report to the

Commission its progress toward achieving this goal by May 1, 1984;

3) that no new MBA or other graduate programs in business be authorized at any public institution whose undergraduate programs are either not accredited by the AACSB or do not meet all of the substantive Standards of that agency;

4) that at such time as a graduate program leading to the MBA offered by a public institution is accredited by the AACSB, the MBA/ETV program offered at that same location be terminated on recommendation of the Commission, and with this exception that the MBA/ETV programs be continued by USC-Columbia; and

5) that the University of South Carolina's College of Business Administration be commended for the high quality of its programs in business, with special reference to the exemplary program leading to the Master of International Business degree.

Foreign Languages. All undergraduate and graduate degree programs in foreign languages at all public colleges and universities were reviewed in 1983. On November 3, 1983, based on the report of the consultants and the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Commission adopted the following recommendations:

1) that all existing degree programs in foreign languages be continued, inviting institutional attention as appropriate to the consultants' recommendations with respect to each;

2) that no additional degree programs in German be planned at any public institution for the forseeable future;

3) that Winthrop College not be encouraged to remove prematurely its graduate programs in French or Spanish from suspension; and

4) that USC-Columbia not be encouraged to plan doctoral programs in foreign languages for the forseeable future.

Associate Degree Programs. In accordance with the provisions of the Master Plan, the Commission annually reviews all programs leading to the associate degree. Data on enrollments, graduates, and placements are collected for all such programs which have been in existence for three or more years. Programs which fail to meet minimum standards must be suspended or cancelled unless their continuation is justified to the Commission in writing. No such program may be continued on probation or remain under suspension for more than three years.

During 1983, 250 active associate degree programs in 28 institutions were evaluated. Ten programs were suspended and 12 were cancelled. In addition, 15 programs remained in suspended status from the previous year. Associate degree programs terminated in 1983 are listed in Table III.

Table III

ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS TERMINATED IN 1983

Institution	Degree	Program
Chesterfield/Marlboro T.C.	A.I.T.	Industrial Safety & Health
Chesterfield/Marlboro T.C.	A.I.T.	Textile Mgmt. Technology
Midlands T.C.	A.E.T.	Safety & Health Engr. Tech.
Midlands T.C.	A.I.T.	Building Construction
Midlands T.C.	A.P.S.	Fire Science
Midlands T.C.	A.I.T.	Industrial Mgmt. Tech.
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Institutional Administration
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Office Administration
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Commercial Science
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Retail Mgmt.
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Nursing
USC-Columbia	A.S.	Child Development

Programs to be Reviewed in 1983-84 and Subsequent Years

Degree programs in history and in political science, as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs, will be reviewed by the Commission in 1983-84, funds permitting. The Commission expects, during 1984, to identify those degree programs scheduled to be reviewed in each of the three subsequent years.

Prerequisites for Freshman Admission

The year 1983 was marked by a resurgence of national interest in the improvement of quality of education at both the public school and post-secondary levels. The Commission's Advisory Committee on Academic Programs undertook a review in September 1982 of admission standards at the public senior colleges and universities. At the request of the Advisory Committee, the State Superintendent of Education nominated six representatives of the public schools to meet with the Advisory Committee to examine the possibility of identifying a consistent set of high school prerequisite courses which all public senior institutions should require of freshman applicants.

Based on the recommendation of the augmented Advisory Committee, the Commission in June 1983 adopted a set of prerequisites to be applicable to all freshmen at public senior institutions in Fall 1988.

By October 1983 the prerequisites were adopted by all of the public senior colleges and universities. The specific prerequisites are listed in Table IV, in which they are compared to requirements for a high school diploma adopted by the State Board of Education in May 1983.

In adopting these recommendations to the institutions, the Commission endorsed these principles as suggested by its Advisory Committee. The prerequisites should:

1) strengthen both the secondary and postsecondary sectors of education;

Table IV

REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND PREREQUISITES FOR FRESHMAN ADMISSION TO S.C. PUBLIC SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

State Department of Education Requirements For High School Diploma		Proposed Prerequisites to be Required of Applicants to Baccalaureate Degree Programs, Public Senior Colleges and Universities, Effective Fall, 1988		
Area	Proposed (Effective 1987) Units	Area	Units	
Language Arts	4	English	4:	At least 2 having strong grammar and composition components, at least 1 in English literature and at least 1 in American literature
Mathematics	3*	Mathematics	3:	Including at least Algebra I and II; a fourth unit, including geometry, is strongly recommended
Science	2**	Laboratory Science	2:	At least 1 unit each of 2 laboratory sciences chosen from biology, chemistry or physics; a third unit of a laboratory science is strongly recommended
U.S. History	1	U.S. History	1	
Economics	½	Economics	½	
Government	½	Government	½	
Other Social Studies	1	Additional Social Studies	1	
		Foreign Language	2:	Two units of the same foreign language
		Other	1:	One unit of advanced mathematics or computer science or a combination of these; or one unit of world history or of international relations
Physical Ed or ROTC	1	Physical Ed or ROTC	1	
Electives	7	Electives	4	
TOTAL	20	TOTAL	20	

* May include 1 unit in computer science

** Or 1 unit in science and 6 or more in occupational areas

2) continue to provide opportunity and access for those students who have not completed the prerequisites but who choose later to continue their education; and

3) support, but be more definitive than, the strengthened requirements for a high school diploma.

Further, required prerequisites should not:

1) guarantee admission to any institution, it being understood that each institution would continue to maintain admission standards -- such as those involving test scores and class rank -- consistent with its mission in the State system; or

2) preclude the requirement by any senior institution of additional high school units for admission to specific degree programs.

Quality Incentives

The Commission has requested, and the Budget and Control Board has recommended, funds for 1984-85 to support a quality incentive program for creative and unusual projects at the institutions based on merit and academic excellence. If funded, grants will be awarded by the Commission to those institutions which submit ideas clearly designed to improve the quality of programs. These grants will assist both the smaller and larger institutions in building areas of excellence beyond what is possible with funds regularly provided for their on-going operations. The Commission expects to limit these grants in 1984-85 to projects related to faculty development.

Desegregation of Public Colleges and Universities

The U.S. Department of Education in January 1981 notified South Carolina and several other states that they were not in compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act because there remained vestiges of their former de jure racially dual systems of public higher education. The State was requested to submit a higher education desegregation plan within 60 days of receipt of the letter. Governor Riley assigned to the Commission on Higher Education the responsibility for developing a positive response to the Department's request.

Under the policy guidance of a Blue Ribbon Steering Committee, appointed by the Commission on Higher Education, and assisted by a Technical Committee of institutional and State agency representatives, the Commission formulated and submitted on March 9, 1981, the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan (The South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity in Public Colleges and Universities, 1981). Subsequent to acceptance of the Plan by the U.S. Department of Education on July 17, 1981, the Commission was designated by the Governor with the responsibility for monitoring and evaluating progress in implementing the Plan.

The Plan provides goals, measures, and timetables for eliminating racial identifiability based on student, faculty, administrator, and board composition at public senior colleges and universities and at Denmark Technical College.

The Plan also includes programs for enhancing the traditionally black State institutions: South Carolina State College and Denmark Technical College. Annual benchmarks have been set for the five years of the Plan for most activities stipulated.

Regarding faculty and administrators, the State is committed in this Plan to increase the proportion of black faculty and administrators at traditionally white institutions at all levels in which blacks are underrepresented, based on the available labor supply. Specific annual benchmarks are included in the affirmative action plans of the individual institutions as approved by the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission, and are pending approval by the U. S. Department of Education. Goals to desegregate further the higher education governing boards are also included in the Plan.

Each year the Commission on Higher Education, with the assistance of the higher education institutions, evaluates the State's progress in achieving Plan objectives. A report of this evaluation is submitted annually to the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education. The second annual evaluation report was submitted in August 1983.

The second annual evaluation revealed that the State is making progress in achieving Plan objectives in several areas, but is experiencing difficulty in meeting Plan benchmarks in other areas. A brief summary of the evaluation results follows.

Enhancement of Traditionally Black Institutions

The State's plan to enhance programs at South Carolina State College and Denmark Technical College is progressing according to the tentative schedule. At South Carolina State College all equipment requested has been purchased, and 24.5 new faculty and 6.5 new staff positions have been filled. South Carolina State College did not fill 5.5 faculty and 2.5 staff positions authorized for 1982-83.

Faculty salaries at South Carolina State College were maintained at a level comparable to the average salaries at The Citadel and Winthrop College as stipulated in the Plan.

All staff and equipment needed for the second year of the Plan to enhance programs at Denmark Technical College were provided with two exceptions: the planned upgrading of the machine tool technology program and the two-year diploma program in construction management. Funds to address both concerns are included in the 1983-84 Desegregation Plan budget.

Desegregation of Student Enrollment

The State's efforts to increase the proportion of black students at traditionally white institutions have been successful only at certain institutions. The State has not reached the systemwide benchmarks for 1982-83 for desegregating student enrollment at traditionally white institutions. The percentage of black students enrolled at traditionally white senior institutions declined by .05 percent and at two-year institutions by 1.3 percent. Four of the 11 senior institutions met their respective goals while only one of the two-year institutions reached the 1982 enrollment goal.

Thus far the State is not achieving the annual benchmarks for attaining the goal of increasing the number and percent of black first-time freshmen at traditionally white senior institutions. Only three of these 11 institutions achieved their 1982-83 goals although six institutions made progress toward reaching the goals. Enrollment goals for traditionally black institutions will be established during 1984.

The State is striving to increase the proportion of black State residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions and enter graduate and professional schools. In addition to special appropriations to graduate public institutions for graduate student recruitment efforts, special graduate fellowships were provided for other-race students who enroll in public institutions in South Carolina. During 1982-83, fellowships up to $5,000 each were provided to 52 students for a total appropriation

of $250,000. Most of these fellowships (39) were provided to black graduate students enrolled in traditionally white institutions, while the remainder (13) were awarded to white graduate students attending South Carolina State College. Data for 1981-82 and 1982-83 show that no disparity exists between the proportion of black and white baccalaureate graduates who enter graduate school in the State system.

The State will establish annual benchmarks for increasing the proportion of white students attending its two traditionally black institutions. The number of white students enrolled at South Carolina State College and Denmark Technical College increased between Fall 1981 and Fall 1982, although no standards now exist for evaluating this increase. Benchmarks for white student enrollment at these institutions will be established during 1984.

Desegregation of Faculty and Staff

Specific benchmarks to be used by higher education institutions to help the State increase the number and percent of blacks in underrepresented employment areas were set for most institutions by the South Carolina Commission on Human Affairs in 1982-83. Progress toward achieving these benchmarks is being evaluated.

Desegregation of Governing Boards

The Commission noted in the Master Plan that members of the eight governing boards of public senior colleges and universities were predominantly white males, and recommended that "legislation be enacted to provide for the equitable representation of women and minorities on all governing boards of the public postsecondary institutions."

Further, the January 7, 1981, letter from the U.S. Department of Education to Governor Riley requesting that the State submit a Statewide desegregation plan cited "the racial identifiability of governing boards

of public colleges and universities" as one of the reasons for South Carolina's not being in compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. As a result, in the 1981 Desegregation Plan the State adopted as a goal the "increase [of] the number of black persons on the governing boards of public colleges and universities."

Legislation based upon the proposals included in Appendix K* of the South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity (the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan) was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Senate Education Committee in 1982. That legislation included most of the criteria necessary to remove present inequities. These bills, however, did not receive the endorsement of the Senate Education Committee.

A second proposal in the form of a proviso in the 1982 General Appropriation Bill to add three gubernatorial appointees to all governing boards except the Clemson Board of Trustees likewise failed in the Senate. A similar proposal in the House was not reported out by the House Education and Public Works Committee.

The Commission, in keeping with its responsibilities for monitoring the implementation of the Desegregation Plan, established in October 1982 an Ad Hoc Committee (consisting of the chairmen of the governing boards of each of the public institutions and representatives of the Governor's Office, the legislative education committees, and the State Human Affairs Commission) to develop proposed legislation to ensure minority representation on each institutional governing board. The Commission transmitted the legislative proposals developed by this committee, with comments, to the General Assembly in November 1982. Legislation similar to that proposed by the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee was enacted by the 1983 General Assembly, as noted earlier. This legislation stipulated that the appointment or election of members of

*Appendix K to the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan is attached to this report as Appendix A.

governing boards must be based on merit regardless of race, creed, or gender and that selections be made so that the boards are representative of all citizens of the State. That legislation also authorized the Governor to appoint one additional member to the governing board of each public senior college and university except Clemson. As a result, on July 2, 1983, the Governor appointed eight minority members (five men and three women), two of whom to serve ex officio as his designees, to the six affected boards. In addition, as noted, the General Assembly elected a minority member to the Clemson Board of Trustees in February 1983.

Excluding ex-officio members, in 1981 there were 84 members on the governing boards of the public senior colleges and universities, eight of whom were black; of these 84 members, 11 were women, of whom two were black. In 1983 there are 90 members on these governing boards (excluding ex-officio members), of whom 15 are black; of these 90 members, 12 are women, of whom three are black. In addition, two black women serve ex-officio as the Governor's designees on governing boards for a total of 17 minority members on these boards, a doubling of minority representation. A detailed analysis of the composition of the institutional governing boards, the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, and the Commission on Higher Education, is set forth in Table V.

The Commission takes the position that the legislation enacted by the 1983 General Assembly is an important interim step toward achieving equitable minority representation on governing boards. It does not ensure equitable representation of women and minorities on governing boards, however, as recommended in the Master Plan. As noted earlier in the discussion of governance, the Commission recommends that legislation be enacted that will provide equitable representation.

Table V

COMPOSITION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF S.C. PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, THE STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION, AND THE S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION, JULY 1983

Institution or Agency	White Males No.	%	White Females No.	%	Black Males No.	%	Black Females No.	%	Total White No.	%	Total Black No.	%	Total Members
The Citadel*	11	91	0	0	1	9	0	0	10	91	1	9	11
Clemson University	12	92	0	0	1	8	0	0	12	92	1	8	13
South Carolina State College*	2	22	1	11	5	56	1	11	3	33	6	76	9
State College Board	10	59	3	18	3	18	1	6	13	77	4	23	17
University of South Carolina*	15	88	1	6	1	6	0	0	16	94	1	6	17
Winthrop College*	5	50	4	40	0	0	1	10	9	90	1	10	10
Medical University of S. C.*	12	92	0	0	1	8	0	0	12	92	1	9	13
Sub-Totals	67	74	9	10	12	13	3	3	75	83	15	17	90
Commission on Higher Education	11	65	2	12	2	12	2	12	13	76	4	24	17
State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education*	7	88	0	0	1	13	0	0	7	88	1	13	8
Total	85	74	11	10	15	13	5	4	95	83	20	17	115

* Ex-officio members are not included. It should be noted that two ex-officio members are black females, one each serving as the Governor's designee on the Board of MUSC and USC respectively.

Desegregation Plan Activities for 1983-84

The Committee on Implementation of the Desegregation Plan, a standing committee of the Commission on Higher Education, is responsible for overseeing Plan implementation. This Committee is assessing the State's success thus far in implementing specific activities to meet the goals of the Plan, and is attempting to identify successful activities for replication at other institutions. The Committee will recommend the termination of activities not proven to be effective.

The Commission on Higher Education, upon the recommendation of the Implementation Committee, approved the allocation of $443,394 for student recruitment activities at the State's colleges and universities for 1983-84. In addition the Commission approved $2,110,342 for enhancement activities at South Carolina State College and $236,438 for enhancement activities at Denmark Technical College. Funds in the amount of $183,483 were approved for faculty and staff recruitment programs for 1983-84.

Finances

State Appropriations

In 1974-75, public higher education received 21.1% of general revenue; by 1983-84 this had declined to 16.6%. Higher education appropriations increased 91%, while inflation amounted to 112%. At the same time that higher education had fewer real dollars to spend, college and university enrollments increased 44%. During that period, appropriations for the public schools increased 130%, somewhat ahead of the pace of inflation, while their enrollments declined slightly by 1%.

More recently, from 1980-81 to 1983-84, State appropriations for higher education in South Carolina increased from $324.8 million to $364.5 million, or 12.0%. The proportion of State revenue appropriated for higher education decreased during the same period from 19.0% to 17.2%.

Similarly, appropriations for the public senior colleges and universities have increased from $261.5 million in 1980-81 to $289.4 million in 1983-84, a growth of 11.0%. During this period, their share of State revenue decreased from 15.3% to 13.6%, while State revenue increased from $1.709 billion to $2.124 billion, or 24.3%.

Appropriations for public education (K-12) increased from $648.5 million to $807.6 million, or 25.0%, during this same period, reflecting an increase from 37.9% to 38.0% of State revenue. At the same time, enrollments in higher education have continued to show small annual increases while public school enrollments have continued to decline.

The relative decrease in support for higher education since 1980 is a matter of grave concern to the Commission and to the institutions of higher learning (see Table VI). Strong public school and higher education systems

Table VI

COMPARISON OF SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL APPROPRIATIONS*
(1974, 1980, and 1983)

State Appropriations For Public Colleges and Universities:	1974-75 [1]	1980-81 [2]	Preliminary** 1983-84 [3]	Percent Increase 1980-81 Through 1983-84 [4]	Percent Increase 1974-75 Through 1983-84 [5]
Winthrop	6,945,016	11,261,518	13,179,188	17	90
The Citadel	5,870,074	9,355,760	9,840,212	5	67
S.C. State	6,807,997	12,408,221	14,905,254	21	120
Francis Marion	3,569,427	6,417,078	6,617,978	3	85
College of Charleston	6,958,333	11,258,041	12,435,874	10	79
Lander	2,467,073	4,034,033	4,752,592	18	93
Medical University (incl. Hosp., etc.)	42,497,047	69,854,875	74,146,029	6	74
Clemson (Educational & General)	27,711,239	40,791,253	46,162,880	13	67
U.S.C.-Columbia	46,448,900	78,430,385	88,009,622	12	89
U.S.C.-Aiken	978,557	3,622,140	3,709,700	2	279
U.S.C.-Coastal Carolina	1,355,625	4,374,240	5,012,120	15	270
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	1,158,078	4,888,720	5,225,370	7	351
U.S.C. 2-Yr. Branches	1,605,845	4,771,096	5,353,408	12	233
Total	$154,381,205	$261,477,362	$289,430,227	11	87
Colleges & Universities as % of State Revenue	17.7	15.3	13.6	- 10	- 22
State Appropriation for Commission on Higher Education:					
Operations	459,281	718,007	879,465	22	91
Service Programs	638,602	956,969	1,031,146	8	61
Total	$1,097,883	$1,674,975	$1,910,611	14	74
State Appropriation for Technical and Comprehensive Education:	29,064,086	51,234,443	61,045,710	19	100
Total State Appropriation for Public Postsecondary Education:	$184,543,174	$314,386,783	$352,386,548	12	91
Public Postsecondary Education as % of State Revenue	21.1	18.3	16.6	- 9	- 21
State Appropriation for Tuition Aid Grants - Private Colleges:	6,178,875	10,432,761	12,123,026	16	96
Total State Appropriation for Postsecondary Education:	$190,722,049	$324,819,544	$364,509,574	12	91
Postsecondary Education as % of State Revenue:	21.8	19.0	17.2	- 9	- 21
Total State Appropriation for Department of Education:	351,255,607	648,548,410	807,560,741	25	130
Elementary and Secondary Education as % of State Revenue:	40.2	37.9	38.0	0	- 5
Total State Appropriation for All Education:	$541,977,656	$973,367,954	$1,172,070,315	20	116
All Education as % of State Revenue:	62.1	56.9	55.2	- 3	- 11
Total State General Revenue:	$873,330,008	$1,709,191,279	$2,124,158,903	24	143

*Fringe Benefits estimated for years prior to 1977-78.
**Includes preliminary allocation of funds for Desegregation Plan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are vital to the well-being of the citizens of the State and both should be well supported. Underscoring that conviction, the Commission in November 1983 adopted a position paper, that was forwarded to the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee for Financing Excellence in Public Education, which stressed the importance of adequate funding for all of public education, including its postsecondary components. In that paper the Commission stated its position that, if new revenue sources are identified by the General Assembly for education, sufficient funds should be allocated to higher education to achieve full formula funding for each institution as recommended by the Commission. Given that basic level of funding, the Commission also proposed that a portion of such new revenue be allocated for the establishment of up to six school-college centers. The purpose of the centers would be to provide assistance to public school teachers and administrators in continuing efforts to improve the quality of education in the State.

Regional Comparisons

The recent decrease in State support for higher education has had a significant negative impact on South Carolina's ranking with other states. Appropriations per full-time-equivalent (FTE) public college and university student are computed and reported by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) based on figures supplied by the coordinating or governing boards of the 14 states in the southern (SREB) region. Comparability is assured by eliminating all non-student related items and by using a uniform method of determining all FTE students. Table VII compares the appropriations per FTE student in 1980-81 with 1982-83. South Carolina ranked third among the 14 states in 1980-81 and ninth in 1982-83.

Table VII

COMPARISON OF STATE APPROPRIATIONS PER FTE STUDENT IN THE SREB STATES, 1980-81 TO 1982-83*

Universities

	1980-81 $/FTE	Rank	1982-83 $/FTE	Rank	% Change
Alabama	$ 2,537	(12)	2,856	(11)	12.6
Arkansas	2,620	(11)	2,958	(10)	12.9
Florida	3,215	(5)	4,178	(1)	30.0
Georgia	3,512	(2)	4,022	(2)	14.5
Kentucky	2,746	(10)	3,217	(7)	17.2
Louisiana	2,504	(13)	2,756	(13)	10.1
Maryland	3,583	(1)	3,340	(6)	- 6.8
Mississippi	2,779	(9)	2,813	(12)	1.2
N. Carolina	3,340	(4)	3,949	(3)	18.2
S. Carolina	3,489	(3)	3,641	(5)	4.4
Tennessee	2,330	(14)	2,694	(14)	15.6
Texas	2,862	(7)	3,850	(4)	34.5
Virginia	2,915	(6)	3,082	(9)	5.7
W. Virginia	2,785	(8)	3,100	(8)	11.3
SREB Region	2,921		3,444		17.9

Colleges

	1980-81 $/FTE	Rank	1982-83 $/FTE	Rank	% Change
Alabama	$ 2,137	(13)	2,405	(13)	12.5
Arkansas	2,555	(6)	2,768	(7)	8.3
Florida	3,528	(1)	4,686	(1)	32.8
Georgia	2,272	(12)	2,746	(10)	20.9
Kentucky	2,717	(5)	3,122	(5)	14.9
Louisiana	2,437	(9)	2,761	(8)	13.3
Maryland	2,485	(8)	3,044	(6)	22.5
Mississippi	3,098	(2)	3,717	(2)	20.0
N. Carolina	2,882	(3)	3,399	(3)	17.9
S. Carolina	2,734	(4)	2,732	(9)	.7
Tennessee	2,301	(11)	2,506	(12)	8.9
Texas	2,516	(7)	3,133	(4)	24.5
Virginia	2,018	(14)	2,196	(14)	8.8
W. Virginia	2,309	(10)	2,574	(11)	11.5
SREB Region	2,564		2,953		15.2

2 Year Institutions

	1980-81 $/FTE	Rank	1982-83 $/FTE	Rank	% Change
Alabama	$ 2,184	(4)	1,932	(6)	-11.5
Arkansas	2,189	(3)	2,211	(3)	1.0
Florida	1,572	(9)	1,920	(7)	22.1
Georgia	2,042	(5)	2,334	(2)	14.3
Kentucky	1,417	(11)	1,742	(10)	22.9
Louisiana	2,451	(1)	2,675	(1)	9.1
Maryland	1,101	(14)	1,572	(12)	42.8
Mississippi	1,124	(13)	1,107	(14)	- 1.5
N. Carolina	1,302	(12)	1,669	(11)	28.1
S. Carolina	1,442	(10)	1,466	(13)	1.7
Tennessee	1,721	(7)	1,854	(8)	7.7
Texas	1,770	(6)	2,055	(5)	16.1
Virginia	1,619	(8)	1,793	(9)	10.7
W. Virginia	2,274	(2)	2,138	(4)	- 6.0
SREB Region	1,609		1,849		14.9

Total All Institutions

	1980-81 $/FTE	Rank	1982-83 $/FTE	Rank	% Change
Alabama	$ 2,320	(10)	2,386	(13)	2.8
Arkansas	2,519	(4)	2,731	(7)	8.4
Florida	2,240	(12)	2,862	(4)	27.8
Georgia	2,820	(1)	3,528	(1)	25.1
Kentucky	2,540	(2)	2,948	(3)	16.1
Louisiana	2,480	(5)	2,752	(6)	11.0
Maryland	2,419	(8)	2,505	(10)	3.6
Mississippi	2,134	(14)	2,180	(14)	2.3
N. Carolina	2,339	(9)	2,783	(5)	19.0
S. Carolina	2,538	(3)	2,556	(9)	.7
Tennessee	2,170	(13)	2,431	(11)	12.3
Texas	2,433	(7)	3,050	(2)	25.4
Virginia	2,294	(11)	2,429	(12)	5.9
W. Virginia	2,471	(6)	2,712	(8)	9.8
SREB Region	2,388		2,755		15.4

*Funding for medical, dental, and veterinary medical education excluded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This decrease in State support for higher education has also had a negative impact on South Carolina faculty salary averages as compared with other SREB states (see Table VIII). The faculty salary average for South Carolina doctoral institutions ranked third in 1980-81, but had dropped to ninth by 1982-83. Similarly, averages at the master's level institutions dropped from fourth to ninth, at the baccalaureate institutions from sixth to seventh, and at the two-year institutions (including technical colleges) from ninth to eleventh. The overall ranking of South Carolina dropped from fifth in 1980-81 to tenth in 1982-83.

Escalating Student Fees

Students attending public colleges and universities in South Carolina are paying considerably higher tuition and required fees than those attending public institutions in other southeastern states. In some instances, South Carolina students are paying two to three times more. Over the past seven years, student fees in South Carolina public colleges and universities have increased an average of 111.6%, as shown in Table IX. This is a matter of concern to the Commission and to the colleges and universities. The principal reason for these escalating costs is the way the Appropriation Act has been written since 1977-78.

The Appropriation Act states that when operations are augmented by funds other than General Fund Appropriations the agency must pay a proportionate share of employee salaries and fringe benefit costs from such other sources. In the case of the colleges and universities, the major source of other funds is student fees, representing about 20% of total revenue. The Appropriation Act requires that no appropriated funds be used to increase that portion of salaries and fringe benefits paid from such other funds. The State is,

Table VIII
COMPARISON OF FACULTY SALARY AVERAGES IN
THE SREB STATES, 1980-81 TO 1982-83

Doctoral Institutions

	1980-81		1982-83		
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	% Incr.
Alabama	$23,043	11	$26,924	10	16.8
Arkansas	23,873	7	28,431	8	19.0
Florida	25,427	2	29,197	7	14.8
Georgia	25,899	1	31,670	1	22.3
Kentucky	24,769	6	29,294	6	18.3
Louisiana	23,318	9	26,710	11	14.5
Maryland	24,794	5	29,366	5	18.4
Mississippi	22,539	12	24,801	14	9.8
North Carolina[1]	—	—	29,558	3	—
South Carolina	25,426	3	27,981	9	10.0
Tennessee	22,469	13	25,800	12	14.8
Texas	23,131	10	29,858	2	29.1
Virginia	24,817	4	29,580	4	19.1
West Virginia	23,690	8	25,766	13	8.8
SREB Average	24,017		28,696		19.5

Master's Institutions

	1980-81		1982-83		
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	% Incr.
Alabama	$20,053	10	$22,108	13	10.2
Arkansas	19,674	12	23,093	10	17.4
Florida	22,322	2	26,270	2	16.6
Georgia	21,104	5	24,264	7	15.0
Kentucky	20,853	6	24,635	4	18.1
Louisiana	21,964	3	24,174	8	10.1
Maryland	23,810	1	26,927	1	13.1
Mississippi	19,288	13	20,685	14	7.2
North Carolina[1]	—	—	24,447	5	—
South Carolina	21,512	4	23,894	9	11.1
Tennessee	20,271	8	23,020	11	13.6
Texas	20,041	11	25,616	3	27.8
Virginia	20,134	9	24,379	6	21.1
West Virginia	20,496	7	22,557	12	10.1
SREB Average	20,868		24,348		16.7

Baccalaureate Institutions

	1980-81		1982-83		
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	% Incr.
Alabama	$22,320	1	$25,550	1	13.5
Arkansas	17,481	9	20,379	9	16.6
Florida	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	21,130	4	25,036	2	18.5
Kentucky	—	—	—	—	—
Louisiana	21,375	2	22,910	6	7.2
Maryland	21,328	3	—	—	—
Mississippi	—	—	—	—	—
North Carolina[1]	—	—	23,174	4	—
South Carolina	19,410	6	21,736	7	12.0
Tennessee	—	—	—	—	—
Texas	18,299	8	24,944	3	36.3
Virginia	20,620	5	23,164	5	12.3
West Virginia	19,093	7	21,400	8	12.1
SREB Average	19,531		22,168		13.4

Two-Year Institutions

	1980-81		1982-83		
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	% Incr.
Alabama	$20,394	2	$22,513	4	10.4
Arkansas	15,852	14	18,644	10	17.6
Florida	19,042	4	22,585	3	18.6
Georgia	18,636	6	21,442	5	14.9
Kentucky	16,435	10	18,888	9	14.8
Louisiana	18,926	5	21,344	6	12.8
Maryland	22,350	1	26,382	1	18.0
Mississippi	16,016	13	17,277	14	7.9
North Carolina	16,024	12	17,287	13	7.9
South Carolina	16,672	9	18,560	11	11.3
Tennessee	16,736	8	19,384	8	15.7
Texas	20,151	3	25,247	2	25.3
Virginia	17,911	7	21,253	7	18.7
West Virginia	16,084	11	18,292	12	13.9
SREB Average	18,437		21,449		16.3

[1] North Carolina data not available for 1980-81.

Table IX

ANALYSIS OF TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES FOR RESIDENT STUDENTS

Institution	1976-77	1983-84	% Increase
The Citadel	$ 627	$ 1620	158.4
S.C. State	520	900	73.1
Winthrop	690	1212	75.6
College of Chas.	550	1470	167.3
Francis Marion	410	940	129.3
Lander	560	1270	130.9
U.S.C.-2 yr Campuses	570	920	61.4
-4 yr Campuses	570	1000	75.4
-Columbia*	662	1440	117.5
Clemson	720	1652	129.4
Medical University**	660	1400	112.1
Average All Institutions	$ 594	$ 1257	111.6

*Excludes Medical School

**Pharmacy, Nursing & Allied Health only.

therefore, providing only about $.80 of every $1.00 for salary and fringe benefit increases mandated at the colleges and universities. When the General Assembly grants an annual 5% or 10% pay increase for State employees, it is in effect requiring an increase in student fees under the present Appropriation Act language. The Commission is acutely aware of the financial constraints the State has faced. It believes, however, that this is an unfair tax being placed upon the parents and students attending South Carolina public colleges and universities. If student fees continue to escalate, public higher education in South Carolina will become accessible only to the elite.

In the 1983-84 Appropriation Act, the General Assembly expressed concern over the increasing tuition and fees at the public colleges and universities and requested that the Commission conduct a study of the costs of higher education, both to the student and to the State, and compare these costs with those in other states in order to make recommendations to the General Assembly in January 1984. This study is currently underway.

Appropriation Formula

The Commission on Higher Education began the development of an appropriation formula in January 1971. Its purpose is to fund the State's public colleges and universities objectively, equitably, and adequately. The Commission has based its appropriation recommendations on the formula since 1972-73. The General Assembly, in the 1973-74 and several subsequent General Appropriation Acts, directed the Budget and Control Board and the Commission to continue formula development. The 1980-81 Appropriation Formula was completely revised to address more adequately the special needs of the different institutions.

In Spring 1983 the Commission staff, working with USC and MUSC staff, drafted a modified formula for medical and dental education, which was adopted by the Commission in July 1983. Beginning with the 1984-85 appropriation request all public senior colleges and universities prepare their requests based on the Appropriation Formula. Even though the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (SBTCE) uses a different formula, the Commission verifies SBTCE's appropriation request by using its credit hour data in the Commission's formula calculations. The SBTCE and Commission staffs have been charged with the development of a funding formula for technical institutions comparable to the Commission's Appropriation Formula, which will eliminate the necessity of having two separate formulas for use by the Commission and by SBTCE.

The Commission annually revises the Appropriation Formula and updates such features as faculty salary averages and institutional support percentages. The Commission is conducting an analysis of the cost of two-year education (the technical colleges and the USC two-year branch campuses), the results of which will be very important in the formula review process in 1984. The purpose of this study is also to determine the cost effectiveness of these institutions and segments and to make recommendations for improvement where necessary. A similar cost study is planned for the senior colleges and universities. A copy of the 1984-85 Appropriation Formula is attached as Appendix B.

Budgetary Process

The budgetary requirements of the State Budget and Control Board, the General Assembly, and the Commission on Higher Education have been reconciled and the public colleges and universities and the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education have been using one format and one comprehensive set of instructions since 1980. The Budget and Control Board and the Commission are in agreement on procedural matters pertaining to basic budget allocations

and relevant guidelines for public institutions of higher learning. For the past three years, the Budget and Control Board has allocated a lump sum to the Commission which has been reallocated, based on actual enrollments, to the institutions by application of the Commission's Appropriation Formula. As a result of this procedure, the Commission's earlier recommendation concerning the need for enrollment adjustment provisos in the annual General Appropriation Act is no longer relevant and is rescinded. The Commission reaffirms its recommendation that the State Auditor's Office reinstitute the former practice of verifying computation of FTE student enrollments.

Although the Commission recommended in the Master Plan a sharp reduction in the detail now required in the Budget and Control Board's line-item budgets, the trend of the General Assembly is to require additional reporting from State agencies rather than less. The Commission reaffirms its earlier recommendation. The Commission plans to initiate conferences with appropriate groups in State Government in an effort to improve this portion of the budgetary process through elimination of unnecessary duplicative reporting that complicates and delays the preparation of appropriation requests.

Student Financial Aid

The provision of adequate financial aid to students in South Carolina continues to be of concern. Escalating costs of higher education, in both the public and private sectors, have resulted in significantly higher charges to students and their parents in recent years.

In the face of these increases, the aid available to all students enrolled in institutions within the State appears to be decreasing. A survey conducted by the Commission in 1983 shows estimated student aid in the State of $168 million in 1982-83, compared to $176 million in 1981-82. Details are shown in Tables X and XI. The survey also indicated

Table X

STUDENT AID IN SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

Major Federal Programs	Amounts Awarded, in Thousands of Dollars 1981-82 (Actual)	1982-83 (Estimated)
National Direct Student Loans	$ 5,751	$ 5,550
Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants	4,254	3,633
College Work-Study Program	8,560	8,324
Pell Grants	33,031	32,153
Veterans' Benefits	48,868	40,295
Reserve Officer Training Grants	1,051	1,145
Vocational Rehabilitation Grants	332	263
Sub-Totals	$101,667	$ 91,363
Other Federal Programs	$ 4,352	$ 3,763
State Programs		
Tuition Grants (not incl. SSIG)	$ 11,816	$ 11,472
Guaranteed Loans (in-State attendance only)	7,395	7,025
PLUS Loans (in-State attendance only)	- 0 -	95
Sub-Totals	$ 19,211	18,593 *
Institutional Programs		
Schol./Grants	$ 15,099	$ 16,919
Loans	1,472	1,682
Jobs	15,535	15,717
Sub-Totals	$ 32,106	34,318
Other Sources		
Schol./Grants	$ 4,415	$ 4,759
Loans	405	189
Jobs	460	451
Guar./Insur. Loans (from other states)	13,332	14,407
PLUS Loans (from other states)	48	94
Sub-Totals	$ 18,660	19,899
TOTALS	$175,996	$ 167,937 *

* Due to rounding, sum of parts not equal to total.

Table XI

ESTIMATED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID IN SOUTH CAROLINA, BY SECTOR, 1982-83

Major Federal Programs	Amounts Awarded, in Thousands of Dollars Public	Private	Totals
National Direct Student Loans	$ 3,360	$ 2,190	$ 5,550
Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants	1,793	1,841	3,633*
College Work-Study Program	4,617	3,707	8,324
Pell Grants	21,766	10,388	32,153*
Veterans' Benefits	35,137	5,158	40,295
Reserve Officer Training Grants	1,145	-	1,145
Vocational Rehabilitation Grants	187	76	263
Sub-Totals	$ 68,005	$23,360	$ 91,363*
Other Federal Programs	$ 2,801	$ 962	$ 3,763
State Programs			
Tuition Grants (not incl. SSIG)	$ -	$11,472	$ 11,472
Guaranteed Loans (in-State attendance only)	5,656	1,369	7,025
PLUS Loans (in-State attendance only)	77	19	95*
Sub-Totals	$ 5,733	$12,860	$ 18,593
Institutional Programs			
Schol/Grants	$ 6,558	$10,360	$ 16,919*
Loans	427	1,255	1,682
Jobs	14,420	1,297	15,717
Sub-Totals	$ 21,405	$12,913	$ 34,318
Other Sources			
Schol/Grants	$ 3,246	$ 1,514	$ 4,759*
Loans	111	78	189
Jobs	262	189	451
Guar./Insur. Loans (from other states)	10,128	4,279	14,407
PLUS Loans (from other states)	66	28	94
Sub-Totals	$ 13,813	$ 6,088	$ 19,899*
TOTALS	$111,756	$56,182	$167,937*

* Due to rounding, sum of parts not equal to total.

that students from lower income families have so far been relatively well shielded from any reduction in available aid. This is because most aid to students is based on financial need.

The principal channel through which State aid is provided to students in public institutions remains State appropriations made in support of the operation of public institutions. That support enables the institutions to charge students substantially less in tuition and fees than would otherwise be required.

The two principal programs of direct financial aid provided by the State to students are the Tuition Grants and Guaranteed Loan Programs. Each of these serves a most useful purpose.

It was recommended in the Master Plan that consideration be given to the need for legislation to provide incentive scholarships for students in nursing and in allied health. Because students in these disciplines are eligible for the same kinds of financial aid as are available to all other undergraduate students in colleges and universities, the Commission rescinds those earlier recommendations. The recommendation that statutory authority for the State Grants Program be enacted, continuing in its present form and continuing its administration by the Commission, is rescinded; the program has been phased out by the General Assembly -- reduced funding was provided in 1982-83 for this purpose and none was provided for the 1983-84 fiscal year. The recommendation that a separate State appropriation be made for the purpose of matching funds in the small federal "State Student Incentive Grant" program is also rescinded.

The Commission recommended in the Master Plan that the South Carolina Defense Scholarship Fund be discontinued. The Commission, influenced by more recent developments, now rescinds that recommendation. This Fund is

authorized by statute. Its purpose is to provide loans made by institutions to students. New federal contributions are made each year directly to the institutions; the Defense Scholarship Fund provides for public institutions the required match of $1 (State or institutional) for each $9 of such new federal money. The Commission for years had administered this program for and at the request of the State Auditor. For the past two years, no funds were appropriated to the Commission for this program. In order for the public institutions to continue participation in this federally assisted program, the Commission has again requested funds for this purpose in 1984-85. There is increased urgency for this program in light of the high tuition and fees at our public colleges and universities.

The Commission reaffirms its recommendation in the Master Plan that it be charged with administering any newly created State financial aid programs.

In the Master Plan, the Commission recommended that two new State-funded programs of student aid be established. One would create a State-wide work-study program, coordinating part-time job opportunities for students. The other would create an honors scholarship program, providing scholarships to be awarded to State residents based solely on academic merit. Neither recommendation has been pursued, in view of the financial difficulties which have faced the State over the past several years.

The staff in 1984, in consultation with others as appropriate, will develop detailed proposals for the student employment and honors scholarship programs. Also during 1984, the staff will conduct a study of financial aid available to graduate students in the State.

Facilities

Before 1980, the institutions were not required by law to submit capital improvement requests to the Commission. The Budget and Control Board in 1971, however, directed that requests from the public senior institutions be submitted through the Commission for comment and reaffirmed this procedure in 1974.

As recommended in the Master Plan, the S.C. Code of Laws was amended in 1980 (in Act 518) to require that all public higher education institutions submit their requests for capital improvements to the Commission for its review and recommendations to the Budget and Control Board. The Commission reaffirms its recommendation that the legislation be further amended to require that all requests to lease space for residential or other uses be submitted initially to the Commission for its review and transmitted to the Budget and Control Board with appropriate recommendations.

As a result of the Master Plan, the Commission completed a Building Quality Survey in 1981 in which the condition of existing facilities at the public colleges and universities, including the technical colleges, was evaluated. Of the 333 buildings included in the survey,* 232 (69.7%) were not rated as satisfactory. The estimated cost of rehabilitating these 232 buildings was $41.7 million. The Commission recommended that all facilities be brought up to standard before new facilities are built. The Commission, also in 1981, developed a Model Energy Conservation Plan for the higher education institutions in South Carolina which received a Governor's Energy Achievement Award.

*The survey excluded all facilities constructed or completely renovated after January 1, 1975, and certain other facilities (e.g., leased, married student housing, parking, and intercollegiate athletic facilities).

Capital Improvements

The five-year Permanent Improvement Plans of the public colleges and universities, submitted to the Commission in July 1982 for consideration for funding, included 121 projects estimated to cost $238 million ($179 million in Capital Improvement Bonds, $3 million in local funds, $17 million in gifts/grants and other funds, and $39 million in revenue bonds). These requests included 24 rehabilitation projects estimated to cost more than $33 million. Because of the urgency of the need to bring campus facilities up to a satisfactory standard, the Commission recommended that these 24 projects be given top priority for 1983. However, during 1983 (as was also the case in 1982) the General Assembly did not authorize any Capital Improvement Bond funding for the colleges and universities. Capital funds appropriated for these institutions from 1968 through 1983 are set forth in Table XII.

Rehabilitation and Maintenance

The Master Plan committed the Commission on Higher Education to work toward bringing all campus facilities to at least a "satisfactory" standard as defined in the Commission's Building Quality Evaluation Procedures Manual, and then to ensure that this standard is maintained.

The Commission contracted with J. E. Sirrine Company, Greenville, in 1981 to conduct the evaluation, noted earlier, of most of the facilities of public colleges and universities. Of the 262 non-residential buildings included in the survey, 173 (66.0%) were not rated satisfactory; of the 71 residential facilities included, 59 (83.1%) were not rated satisfactory. The estimated costs of renovating these 173 non-residential buildings and 59 residential buildings were $20.8 million and $20.9 million, respectively.

As noted above, the colleges and universities in 1982 submitted 24 rehabilitation projects, estimated to cost more than $33 million, for

Table XII

CAPITAL FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE S.C. GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1968-83[1]

	1968-1978	1979	1980	1981	1982[4]	1983[4]	Total
Clemson	$ 31,502,234	$ 810,000	$ 2,200,000	$ 7,400,000[3]	-	-	$ 41,912,234
USC-Columbia	44,022,540	1,250,000	8,872,000	-	-	-	54,144,540
Sub-Total	75,524,774	2,060,000	11,072,000	7,400,000	-	-	96,056,774
Citadel	7,511,934	2,390,000[2]	3,650,000	1,259,000[3]	-	-	14,810,934
College of Charleston	28,461,200	2,480,000	577,800	-	-	-	31,519,000
Francis Marion	18,297,500	1,066,000	255,200	-	-	-	19,618,700
Lander	11,965,845	500,000	877,600	5,415,000[3]	-	-	18,758,445
S.C. State	14,397,400	3,600,000	-	5,000,000[3]	-	-	22,997,400
Winthrop	3,479,150	6,955,000[2]	4,000,000	-	-	-	14,434,150
Sub-Total	84,113,029	16,991,000	9,360,600	11,674,000	-	-	122,138,629
USC-Aiken	4,644,000	416,000	1,232,000	1,500,000	-	-	7,792,000
USC-Coastal	7,106,203	57,000	2,926,000	-	-	-	10,089,203
USC-Spartanburg	4,887,500	350,000	-	5,476,000[3]	-	-	10,713,500
USC-Two-Year	-	1,200,000	818,100	3,650,000[3]	-	-	5,668,100
Sub-Total	16,637,703	2,023,000	4,976,100	10,626,000	-	-	34,262,803
MUSC	30,476,985	2,600,000	33,450,000	-	-	-	66,526,985
SBTCE	13,502,500	11,816,000	9,542,979	12,303,000	-	-	47,164,479
Total	$ 220,254,991	$ 35,490,000	$ 68,401,679	$ 42,003,000	-	-	$ 366,149,670

Note:
1. All funds were provided by the Capital Improvement Bonds Act, Act No. 1377, 1968 as amended, except direct appropriations of $8,047,955 provided by Act 354, 1973.
2. Winthrop must repay $3,120,000 provided in 1979 and The Citadel $400,000 provided in 1980 through a seat tax on Athletic Facilities.
3. Projects authorized in Act 179 of 1981 with a proviso requiring the Budget and Control Board to reduce the Capitol Improvement Bonds authorized by any capability to issue Institution (Tuition) Bonds and by any surplus debt service funds.
4. The Capitol Improvement Bond Act was not amended in 1982 and 1983.

consideration for funding in 1983. It was concluded that the current condition of existing facilities demonstrated need for policy and procedures to address campus rehabilitation requirements on a continuing basis.

The Commission adopted a policy and procedures to address campus rehabilitation needs in June 1983 and recommended that they also be approved by the Budget and Control Board and by the Joint Bond Review Committee. The Commission further recommended that each institution's rehabilitation reserve funds be placed in an account where interest would accrue to the institution. The Budget and Control Board in October 1983 approved in concept a Statewide policy concerning capital improvements that encompassed in general terms the policy adopted by the Commission. Final action by the Budget and Control Board is pending.

III. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN

The Master Plan contains detailed procedures for annually reviewing the Plan. Thus far, it has not been feasible to apply these procedures to the Plan as a whole. Substantial progress nevertheless has been made, as noted in this review, in implementing the Plan's recommendations.

Based on the experience of the Commission and staff since the publication of the Master Plan, the Commission has modified and revised the planning cycle. The following procedures will preserve the original intent and purpose while simplifying the procedure. The Commission will annually:

1) select the specific generic area(s) for review and evaluation (e.g., enrollments, graduate education, libraries, facilities, or cost analysis of programs);

2) publicize major issues through the press or other media, as appropriate;

3) seek the opinions and suggestions of the Governor and legislative leaders, the colleges and universities, the State Department of Education, and other agencies and constituencies with respect to specific issues, as appropriate;

4) maintain on-going contact with the institutions, the Office of the Governor, appropriate Committees of the General Assembly, and other State agencies as part of the planning process; and

5) appoint advisory committees for specific tasks as necessary;

As a culmination of activities such as those enumerated above, the staff will draft the annual review for consideration and appropriate action by the Commission by December of each year.

These procedures supersede the annual planning cycle as set forth in the Master Plan.

APPENDICES

A. Proposed Revision of the Governing Boards of [South Carolina Public Colleges and Universities], State Higher Education Desegregation Plan, Appendix K, pp. 269-75

B. 1984-85 Appropriation Formula

APPENDIX A

Appendix K *

February 25, 1981

TO: Steering Committee to Guide the Development of the South Carolina Plan to Desegregate Public Colleges and Universities

FROM: Subcommittee to Recommend a Plan to Desegregate Governing Boards of State Colleges and Universities

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THE CITADEL, MUSC, SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, STATE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND WINTHROP

These governing boards shall be composed of 15 members each, excluding ex officio members. Two members shall be elected from each Congressional District by the General Assembly, and the Governor shall appoint three members at large with the approval of the Senate.

All terms will be four years, corresponding with the fiscal year, and there will be a limitation of three consecutive terms or parts of a term for each member. Presently serving Board members who are elected under the terms of this legislation will have the status of a new Board member. All vacancies will be filled in the same manner in which the original election or appointment took place.

It is suggested that the filling of these Boards occur in the following manner:

1. All existing Board members shall be entitled to serve out the remainder of the term for which they were elected should they so choose. (This will have the effect, probably, of causing each Board to have a different number of members for a short period of time until the new system takes over entirely.)

2. In the first year of implementation of this plan, one member from each Congressional District will be elected by the General Assembly and two members will be appointed by the Governor for each Board in the state.

3. Two years after that first election, another member to each Board shall be elected from each Congressional District and one additional appointment by the Governor will be made. (This will have the effect of staggering the terms on the Boards so that eight members of each Board will be up for renewal of their terms in years 5, 9, 13, etc., and seven members of each Board will be up for renewal of their terms in years 7, 11, 15, etc.)

*Excerpt from the State Higher Education Desegregation Plan, pp. 269-75.

4. Any presently seated Board member who chooses to run for a seat under the new plan shall be deemed to have resigned his or her present term upon the qualification of the new member thus elected. (This will have the effect of putting before those presently seated a choice of whether to serve out their present term or to seek election for a "new" term under the proposed system.)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The following ex officio members or their designee shall serve on each Board.

Governor
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
Chairman, House Education and Public Works Committee
State Superintendent of Education

In addition to the above members, The Citadel shall have these ex officio members or their designee:

Adjutant General
Chairman, Senate General Committee
Chairman, House Medical, Military, Municipal and Public Affairs Committee

MUSC shall have these additional ex officio members or their designee:

Chairman, Senate Medical Affairs Committee
Chairman, House Medical, Military, Municipal and Public Affairs Committee

The legislation which would encompass this plan should include this language:

"Every consideration shall be given to the geographic residence, gender, minority status and economic status to assure that Board members shall be representative of all citizens of the state."

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Clemson University Board of Trustees will be composed of 13 members, seven successors to those named in the Thomas Clemson Will, three members elected at large by the General Assembly and three members appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate.

All terms will be four years, corresponding with the fiscal year, and there will be a limitation of three consecutive terms or parts of a term for each member. Presently serving Board members who are elected under the terms of this legislation will have the status of a new Board member. All vacancies will be filled in the same manner in which the original election or appointment took place.

It is suggested that the filling of these Boards occur in the following manner:

1. All existing Board members shall be entitled to serve out the remainder of the term for which they were elected.

2. In 1984, the three vacancies for Clemson's Board shall be filled as follows: one shall be elected at large by the General Assembly and two shall be appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate. In 1986, two members shall be elected at large by the General Assembly and one shall be appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate.

The legislation which would encompass this plan should include this language:

> "Every consideration shall be given to geographic residence, gender, minority status and economic status to assure that Board members shall be representative of all citizens of the state."

Statement of Clarification Regarding the State's Commitment to the Goal "Increasing the Number of Black Persons Appointed to Governing Boards of Public Higher Education Institutions in the State."

Following the submission of the South Carolina Plan (dated March 9, 1981), there appeared to be a misunderstanding on the part of a number of individuals and several institutions regarding the State's commitment in the Plan to increase the number of black persons appointed to governing boards of public higher education institutions. The Commission requested an Attorney General's opinion to clarify the nature and extent of the State's commitment in the Plan regarding the composition of governing boards of public higher education institutions. A copy of the letter of request and the opinion are attached.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
RUTLEDGE BUILDING
1429 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

HOWARD R. BOOZER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE
803/758-3407

April 29, 1981

The Honorable Daniel R. McLeod
Attorney General of South Carolina
Wade Hampton Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Mr. McLeod:

There appears to be a misunderstanding on the part of several individuals and institutions regarding the State's commitment in the Desegregation Plan to increase the number of black persons appointed to governing boards of public higher education institutions. I have discussed this matter with Dr. James E. Bostic, Chairman of the Commission, and we formally request an Attorney General's opinion to clarify the nature and extent of the State's commitment in the Plan regarding the composition of governing boards of public higher education institutions.

The State is required to submit additional materials to be included in the Plan by May 7, 1981. The presidents of public higher education institutions have been requested to sign the Plan by the May 7 deadline. A clarification of the State's commitment regarding governing boards will enhance the sign-off procedure. Consequently, an immediate response to our request is urgently needed.

We appreciate the assistance which your office continues to provide in the State's effort to develop and implement effective procedures for insuring that postsecondary education is available to all South Carolinians who seek it.

Sincerely,

Howard R. Boozer

Howard R. Boozer

ejd

cc: Dr. James E. Bostic, Jr.
Mr. James Holly

The State of South Carolina

Office of the Attorney General

DANIEL R. McLEOD
ATTORNEY GENERAL

REMBERT C. DENNIS BUILDING
POST OFFICE BOX 11549
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211
TELEPHONE 803-758-3667

April 29, 1981

Mr. Howard R. Boozer, Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Mr. Boozer:

Attached hereto is a letter from you requesting the opinion of this Office on the nature and extent of the commitment of the State, its agencies and institutions in the South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity in The Public Colleges and Universities regarding the composition of the governing boards of such colleges and universities.

After reviewing pages 3 - 5, 20 - 22 and 73 of the Plan, the signature page of the Plan and the Revised Criteria developed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it is the opinion of this Office that the Plan commits the State and the agencies and institutions involved with the Plan to a good faith effort to make progress toward increasing the number of black persons appointed to the governing boards of public higher education institutions. The Plan notes that this matter will require legislation by the General Assembly and provides that such legislation will include minority status as a consideration in the procedures adopted for making appointments to such governing boards. The Plan, however, does not restrict the State or the involved agencies and institutions tc effecting a specific measure or piece of legislation,

Continuation Sheet Number Two
To: Mr. Howard R. Boozer
April 29, 1981

such as Appendix K of the Plan, to make progress toward achieving this goal.

Sincerely,

James M. Holly
Assistant Attorney General

JMH:djg

Attachment

APPROVED BY:

Daniel R. McLeod
Attorney General

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1984-85 APPROPRIATION FORMULA
FOR CONTINUING OPERATIONS

The Appropriation Formula provides for equitable sharing of state taxpayer support for South Carolina's public colleges and universities. Realistic appropriations are computed impartially by using actual enrollments, proven student/faculty ratios, uniform salary assumptions, and justifiable average percentages to cover the agreed programs (instruction, research, public service, etc.) of the institutions.

****

1. STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

Use the number of student credit hours produced, by level of instruction and academic discipline, during the fall 1983 semester. Include half credit for contact hours in physical education and remedial courses unless credit hours toward a degree are awarded for such courses. (See CHE Report 14)

2. FTE (FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT) STUDENTS

Divide undergraduate credit hours by 15
professional (law) " " " 15
master's level " " " 12
and doctoral " " " 9
to determine the number of FTE students to be taught. (See CHE Report 3)

N O T E

From Table 1 determine the appropriate Academic Discipline Table 2, 3, or 4 to be used in calculating steps 3, 4a and 4b for your institution.

3. FTE TEACHING FACULTY

To find the number of FTE teaching faculty positions required, divide the number of FTE students at each level and in each academic discipline by an appropriate student/faculty ratio.

4. INSTRUCTION

a. Compute the cost of teaching faculty salaries by multiplying the FTE teaching faculty by peer group faculty salary average for each discipline and level.

b. Multiply the cost of teaching faculty salaries for each discipline and level by the corresponding peer group instructional support percentage to obtain total cost for instructional support.

c. add a and b.

d. Of the total number of FTE teaching faculty (other than military science) required, determine the proportion to be filled by teaching assistants. (Use the proportion on fall 1982 CHE Report 9, unless justification for a different proportion is presented). Multiply the number of FTE teaching assistants required by $X,XXX (difference between average salary of faculty other than teaching assistants and average salary of teaching assistants for fall 1982 for your institution), plus improvements of 5 % for 1983-84. (See CHE Report 10)

e. The difference between 4c and 4d equals total costs for instruction.

5. RESEARCH

25% of prior year sponsored research and non-general fund research expenditures at your institution equals total costs for research.

6. PUBLIC SERVICE

25% of prior year sponsored public service and non-general fund public service expenditures at your institution equals total costs for public service.

7. ACADEMIC SUPPORT - LIBRARIES

10% of total instructional costs (as determined in step 4e) to cover library acquisitions and operations equals total costs for academic support - libraries.

8. ACADEMIC SUPPORT - OTHER

12% of total instructional costs (as determined in step 4e) to cover museums and galleries, educational media services, academic computing support, ancillary support, academic administration, and academic personnel development equals total costs for academic support - other.

9. STUDENT SERVICES

$150 - 1st 4,000 headcount students, $125 - 2nd 4,000 headcount students, $100 - 3rd 4,000 headcount students, $75 - all over 12,000 headcount students enrolled fall 1982, plus $4 per student credit hour as determined in step 1 equals total costs for student services.

10. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

a. For physical plant general services, use formula I, Table 5.

b. For building maintenance, use formula II, Table 5.

c. For custodial services, use formula III, Table 5.

d. For grounds maintenance, use formula IV, Table 5.

e. Add the actual 1981-82 expenditures for utilities (see Table 6 for definitions) plus 6 % per year (14 % for natural gas).

f. The sum of 10a through 10e equals total costs for operation and maintenance of plant.

11. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

a. Sub-total steps 4e, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

b. 15% of this total or $50,000 (whichever is larger) equals total costs for institutional support.

12. UNIQUE COSTS

Funding to provide for unique costs and to respond to differences which exist among institutions because of different roles and missions, which are not provided for in previous steps, may be requested. Items included should be of such nature as to require subjective analysis and judgment. When requests for such items are included, they must be subjectively justified (to include how the item is unique, special or not included in previous components of the formula) and specific amounts of costs by program must be detailed as to personnel services, equipment and other operating expenses.

13. STATE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS

Use state employer contributions as calculated by State Personnel Division for personnel included in the programs funded by the Formula.

14. COST OF EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS

Add the amounts calculated in Steps 11a, 11b, and 13. From this total subtract the amount of teaching faculty salaries for academic discipline 1800, Military Science, computed in Step 4a. This is the total cost of educational and general (E & G) operations.

15. REVENUE TO BE GENERATED BY THE INSTITUTION IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS

Multiply the amount calculated in Step 14 by .17 (S.C. State .07, MUSC .05) Multiply the resulting amount by 1.XXX (Where .XXX equals the percent of out-of-State students enrolled in Fall 1982). This is the total revenue to be generated by the institution for E & G operations.

16. STATE FUNDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS

Subtract the amount calculated in Step 15 from the amount calculated in Step 14, and add the amount calculated in Step 12. This is the amount of total State funds required for educational and general operations.

Approved by CHE June 2, 1983

TABLE 1

APPROPRIATION FORMULA INSTITUTION GROUPS

GROUP I

Institutions conferring the doctoral degree as the highest degree awarded:

Clemson University
U.S.C. - Columbia
Medical University

GROUP II

Institutions conferring the bachelor's or master's degree as the highest degree awarded:

College of Charleston
Francis Marion College
Lander College
S.C. State College
The Citadel
U.S.C. - Aiken
U.S.C. - Coastal
U.S.C. - Spartanburg
Winthrop College

GROUP III

College level 2-year branches of 4 year institutions:

U.S.C. - Beaufort
U.S.C. - Lancaster
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie
U.S.C. - Sumter
U.S.C. - Union

TABLE 2

S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE DATA

INSTITUTION GROUP I

		STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS					SUPPORT PERCENTAGES		
		U/G	G-1	G-2	AVG SAL		U/G	G-1	G-2
0400	ARCHITECTURE	13	08	06	28,606		.28	.28	.28
0600	BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	24	17	12	32,632		.30	.30	.30
1300	TEACHER EDUCATION	21	12	09	26,428		.35	.35	.35
1399	PRACTICE TEACHING	11	08	03	26,428		.35	.35	.35
1700	NURSING (ASSOC.)	07	08	03	17,686		.20	.00	.00
1800	ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES	07	08	08	24,799		.23	.23	.23
1801	SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY	06	04	04	33,500		.23	.23	.23
1804	CLINICAL SCI.-DENTISTRY	08	03	03	43,717		.35	.35	.35
1810	CLINICAL SCIENCE-MEDICINE	03	02	02	43,717		.35	.35	.35
1811	NURSING (BA & ABOVE)	07	07	07	22,863		.35	.35	.35
1814	PHARMACY	10	08	08	27,846		.60	.60	.60
1841	NURSE/MIDWIFERY	08	04	05	31,803		.38	.38	.38
1862	PHARM-D	08	03	03	31,290		.60	.60	.60
1883	GRADUATE MEDICINE	08	02	02	43,717		.38	.38	.38
1884	GRADUATE DENTISTRY	08	02	02	43,717		.38	.38	.38
1899	PUBLIC HEALTH	17	08	08	33,699		.23	.23	.23
1900	HOME ECONOMICS	12	12	10	23,267		.39	.39	.39
2200	LAW	08	02	07	48,481		.31	.31	.31
2500	LIBRARY SCIENCE	19	11	11	31,366		.25	.25	.25
2699	BASIC SCIENCE-MED/DENTAL	06	03	03	33,858		.70	.70	.70
2800	MILITARY SCIENCE	12	08	08	21,909		.48	.48	.48
4000	TECHNICAL/VOCATIONAL	08	08	03	21,909		.48	.48	.48
4301	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	19	15	15	29,354		.22	.22	.22
4407	SOCIAL WORK	19	16	15	29,354		.22	.22	.22
5099	FINE & APPLIED ARTS	13	08	06	25,963		.28	.28	.28
0900	COMMUNICATIONS	22	14	09	28,623		.30	.30	.30
1408	FOOD TECHNOLOGY	23	16	07	28,623		.38	.38	.38
2300	LETTERS	20	12	06	25,885		.15	.15	.15
2499	GENERAL STUDIES	20	12	06	28,810		.15	.00	.00
3002	INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY	20	16	08	29,232		.23	.23	.23
4208	PSYCHOLOGY	20	16	08	28,630		.38	.38	.38
4430	PUBLIC AFFAIRS & SERVICES	20	12	06	29,354		.18	.18	.18
4500	SOCIAL SCIENCES	20	12	06	29,081		.22	.22	.22
1100	COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE	22	09	07	31,685		.60	.60	.60
2600	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	22	09	07	31,673		.70	.70	.70
2700	MATHEMATICS/STATISTICS	22	09	07	32,321		.18	.18	.18
4008	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	22	09	07	32,324		.88	.88	.88
0208	AGRICULTURE	17	08	03	29,511		.45	.45	.45
0305	FORESTRY	17	08	03	29,511		.60	.60	.60
3103	PARKS & RECREATION MGT.	17	08	03	29,354		.40	.40	.40
1400	ENGINEERING	18	11	06	32,553		.60	.60	.60

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

INSTITUTION GROUP II

S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE DATA

		STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS				SUPPORT PERCENTAGES		
		U/G	G-1	G-2	AVG SAL	U/G	G-1	G-2
0600	BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	24	17	00	25,786	.20	.20	.00
1300	TEACHER EDUCATION	21	12	09	23,857	.25	.25	.25
1310	REMEDIAL EDUCATION	14	00	00	20,612	.25	.25	.00
1399	PRACTICE TEACHING	11	00	00	23,857	.25	.25	.00
1700	NURSING (ASSOC.)	07	00	00	20,969	.35	.35	.00
1801	SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY	09	06	00	22,632	.40	.40	.00
1811	NURSING (BA & ABOVE)	07	00	00	21,628	.35	.35	.00
1900	HOME ECONOMICS	14	12	00	21,392	.25	.25	.00
2500	LIBRARY SCIENCE	19	11	00	22,018	.25	.25	.00
2800	MILITARY SCIENCE	12	00	00	21,599	.45	.45	.00
4301	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	19	15	00	20,654	.18	.18	.00
4407	SOCIAL WORK	15	12	00	20,654	.18	.18	.00
5000	FINE & APPLIED ARTS	13	08	00	22,640	.24	.24	.00
0900	COMMUNICATIONS	20	12	00	20,204	.25	.25	.00
1600	FOREIGN LANGUAGES	20	12	00	24,002	.20	.20	.00
2300	LETTERS	20	12	00	22,739	.20	.20	.00
2499	GENERAL STUDIES	20	00	00	20,612	.18	.18	.00
3000	INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY	20	12	00	24,785	.30	.30	.00
4200	PSYCHOLOGY	20	12	00	24,051	.20	.20	.00
4400	PUBLIC AFFAIRS & SERVICE	20	12	00	20,654	.18	.18	.00
4500	SOCIAL SCIENCES	20	12	00	24,363	.18	.18	.00
1100	COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE	22	09	00	25,376	.43	.43	.00
2600	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	22	09	00	25,353	.43	.43	.00
2700	MATHEMATICS	22	09	00	23,038	.25	.25	.00
4000	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	22	09	00	25,120	.43	.43	.00
1400	ENGINEERING	18	11	00	27,127	.45	.45	.00

DEST COPY

TABLE 4

INSTITUTION GROUP III

S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE DATA

		STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS				SUPPORT PERCENTAGES		
		U/G	G-1	G-2	AVG SAL	U/G	G-1	G-2
0600	BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	24	00	00	17,539	.20	.00	.00
1300	EDUCATION	22	00	00	17,887	.25	.00	.00
1700	NURSING (ASSOC.)	07	00	00	17,684	.35	.00	.00
1811	NURSING (BA & ABOVE)	07	00	00	21,628	.35	.35	.00
2500	LIBRARY SCIENCE	19	11	00	22,018	.25	.25	.00
5000	FINE & APPLIED ARTS	13	00	00	18,359	.15	.00	.00
0900	COMMUNICATIONS	20	00	00	15,545	.25	.00	.00
1600	FOREIGN LANGUAGES	20	00	00	19,275	.20	.00	.00
2300	LETTERS	20	00	00	17,902	.20	.00	.00
2499	GENERAL STUDIES	20	00	00	18,160	.18	.00	.00
3000	INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY	20	00	00	18,208	.30	.00	.00
4200	PSYCHOLOGY	20	00	00	18,982	.20	.00	.00
4500	SOCIAL SCIENCES	20	00	00	19,287	.18	.00	.00
1100	COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE	22	00	00	17,876	.43	.00	.00
2600	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	22	00	00	19,560	.43	.00	.00
2700	MATHEMATICS	22	00	00	18,314	.25	.00	.00
4000	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	22	00	00	20,455	.43	.00	.00
1400	ENGINEERING	18	00	00	22,783	.45	.00	.00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

1984-85

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
FORMULA FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

I. GENERAL SERVICES* = SW ([FTES + (2 x FTEE)] x 3.90) + (RCB x .0028)

Definitions of terms used in the formula:

1. SW is the average hourly earnings for services (adjusted) for January, 1983, as shown in the Survey of Current Business published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

2. FTES is the full-time equivalent students determined in step 2.

3. FTEE is the full-time employees enrolled in the State Retirement System as of January 1, 1983.

4. RCB is the replacement cost of buildings which shall be determined by applying the factors for the specific classes of construction, as shown on Markel's Handy Appraisal Chart[1] to the original construction costs of each education, general, and service building.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

II. BUILDING MAINTENANCE* = MCF x RCB

Definitions of terms used in the formula:

1. MCF is the maintenance cost factors designated as follows (factors expressed as percentage figures):

	Wood Frame Construction[2]	Masonary-Wood Construction[3]	Masonry-Concrete Construction[4]
Air Conditioned	1.90	1.45	1.25
Non-Air Conditioned	1.75	1.30	1.10

2. RCB is the replacement cost of buildings as calculated in the formula for Physical Plant General Services.

---

[1]Published by Markal Appraisal Chart Company, 4108 North Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio 45236, as of January and July each year. Use the January 1983 issue for budget submission.
[2]Designated as "Frame" on Markel's Handy Appraisal Chart.
[3]Designated as "Semi-Fireproof" on Markel's Handy Appraisal Chart.
[4]Designated as "Fireproof" on Markel's Handy Appraisal Chart.

TABLE 5
(Continued)

III. CUSTODIAL SERVICES* = $SW \times I \times \frac{GSF}{22,400} \times 2080 \times 1.2$

Definitions of terms used in the formula:

1. SW is the average hourly earnings for services (adjusted) for January, 1983, as shown in the Survey of Current Business published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

2. I represents labor and material inflation factor. For fiscal year 1984-85 this factor is 1.06 .

3. GSF is the gross square feet (outside dimensions) of educational, general, and service buildings.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

IV. GROUNDS MAINTENANCE* = SW (.70P + 122L + .50E)

Definitions of terms used in the formula:

1. SW is the average hourly earnings for services (adjusted) for January, 1983, as shown in the Survey of Current Business published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

2. P is the total linear feet of perimeter of all campus buildings including academic, office, service, administration, etc.

3. L is the total number of acres of lawns and regularly maintained areas (malls, flowerbeds, parking lots, sidewalks, streets, etc.). Exclude all buildings, street areas, and areas covered under organized activities (i.e., college farms).

4. E is the Fall Semester 1983 Headcount Enrollment.

---

* See Table 6 for definition.

TABLE 6

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

DEFINITIONS

I. Physical Plant General Services - Salaries, wages, supplies, travel, equipment, and other operating expenses to carry out the duties of physical plant administration, planning, and general services. Examples of the activities included are:

1. Administration - Salaries, wages, travel, equipment, and other operating costs required to administer one or more functional units of the Physical Plant.

2. Planning - Salaries, wages, travel, equipment, and other costs required to prepare architectural and engineering plans and specifications, for the expansion, renovation, and rehabilitation of physical plant facilities, excluding fees for new construction.

3. Other General Services, including -

(a) Acquisition and repair of general classroom and laboratory furniture. Does not include office furniture.

(b) Central receiving and store of supplies and equipment.

(c) Safety, including fire, occupational, radiation, health and sanitation safety.

(d) Garbage and trash disposal.

(e) Hauling, moving and storing.

(f) Property Insurance

(g) Truck and Automobile expense in general service of the institution.

II. Building Maintenance - Costs, including salaries, wages, supplies, materials, equipment, services, and other expenses, necessary to keep building in good appearance and usable condition and prevent the building from deteriorating once it has been placed in first class condition for that type and age of building. Does not include Auxiliary Enterprise buildings. Building Maintenance includes minor repairs and alterations, costs of materials, hire of personnel, and other necessary expenses for the repair and/or painting of the following: roofs, exterior walls, foundations, flooring, ceilings,

partitions, doors, windows, plaster, structural ironworks, screens, window shades, venetian blinds, plumbing, heating and air conditioning equipment within or a part of the building, electric wiring, light fixtures (including the replacement of lamps), washing of all outside window surfaces, built-in shelving and other related items.

III. Custodial Services - Costs including salaries, wages, supplies, materials, equipment, services, and other expenses necessary to keep the buildings in a clean and sanitary condition. Does not include Auxiliary Enterprise buildings. These services include care of the floors stairways and landings, and restrooms; cleaning chalkboards, inside of windows, walls, and room furniture and fixtures; assigned dusting, removal of waste paper and refuse and other related duties.

Common operations include: Mopping, sweeping, waxing, renovating of floors (sanding and refinishing of floors are excluded); dusting, polishing of furniture and fixtures such as venetian blinds, partitions, pictures, maps, radiators, etc.; cleaning of chalkboards, chalk trays, erasers, and replacement of chalk; washing and dusting of walls, cleaning and disinfecting commodes and urinals, cleaning and washing other fixtures, walls and partitions, and replinishing supplies for restrooms; and emptying and cleaning of waste receptacles, and dusting and cleaning of windows, and other glass surfaces; sweeping and cleaning of entrances, and opening and/or closing of buildings, doors, and windows.

IV. Grounds Maintenance - Costs including salaries, wages, supplies, materials, equipment, services, and other expenses relating to the upkeep of all lands designated as campus property (improved and unimproved) not occupied by actual buildings, including any court, patio, and/or garden or court enclosed by buildings. Grounds Maintenance begins after the site improvements are complete.

Phases of Grounds Maintenance are:

1. Land Improvements
   (a) Permanent - Lawns, trees, shrubs, etc.

   (b) Seasonal - Flowers, bulbs, etc.

2. Circulation Systems
   (a) Vehicular - Streets and roads - improved and unimproved; parking areas - improved and unimproved; traffic controls - signal lights, signs, and barriers.

   (b) Pedestrian - Walks and paths - improved and unimproved.

3. Other Activities
   (a) Campus lighting

   (b) Irrigation Systems

   (c) Non-structural improvements - Walls, fences, fountains, campus furniture, others.

TABLE 6
(Continued)

(d) Anciliary enterprises - Nursery, Greenhouse - areas for special academic study.

V. Utilities - All costs of purchase, manufacture and delivery of utility services, including: electricity, steam heat, water (hot, cold or chilled), sanitary sewers, and gas for heating, cooling and lighting. Does not include costs of utilities for Auxiliary Enterprises.